

Oscar B. Parker
James R. Payne
West A. Payne
Ben B. Pickett
Edwin L. Pierce
Heber Player
Charles E. Pond
Andrew W. Prout, Jr.
Douglas H. Pugh
Frank B. Quady
Conde L. Raguet
Donald B. Ramage
William "K" Ratliff
Wilmer E. Rawie
James H. Ray
Jackson H. Raymer
John T. Ready, Jr.
John W. Reed
Miles P. Refo, 3d
Charles J. Reimann
George R. Reinhart, 3d
Thomas K. Richards
George F. Richardson
William P. Riesenber
Frank H. Rile, Jr.
Maurice H. Rindskopf
Charles M. Robertson
Jack L. Robertson
Hugh M. Robinson
Kenneth G. Robinson
Herman K. Rock
Leon W. Rogers
William K. Rogers
Robert W. Rynd
William J. Salmon
Richard D. Sampson
Alvin F. Sbis
Robert A. Schelling
William J. Schlacks, Jr.
Fred J. Schroeder
Paul G. Schultz, Jr.
Vincent E. Schumacher
Leo R. Schwabe
Robert E. Seibels, Jr.
Raphael Semmes, Jr.
Wade C. Shaffer, Jr.
Walter A. Sharer
Raymond Shile
John B. Shirley
Francis W. Silk
Vincent M. Sim
Harvey H. Sims, Jr.
Robert E. Sinnott
William A. Sissons
David K. Sloan, Jr.
Gordon F. Smale
Walter L. Small, Jr.

Donald E. Smith
John C. H. Smith
Donald D. Snyder, Jr.
Verner J. Soballe
Nathan Sonenshein
Charles D. Sooy
William O. Spears, Jr.
Elbert D. Sprott, Jr.
Roger N. Starks
Sherman H. Stearns
John F. Stevens
James J. Stilwell
Sheldon C. St. John
Harry B. Stott
Ira G. Stubbart
Thomas H. Suddath
Eugene T. B. Sullivan
Irving J. Superfine
Henry E. Surface
Wendell W. Suydam
John R. Sweeney
Paul E. Taft
William J. Tate, Jr.
Leonard W. Thornhill
James E. Tinling
Everett A. Trickey
Joseph R. Tucker
Michael T. Tyng
Newell F. Varney
Eli Vinock
John J. Walsh
Thomas Washington, Jr.
John M. Waters
William P. Watts
Herold J. Weiler, Jr.
Heydon F. Wells
Cecil R. Welte
Otis A. Wesche
Edwin M. Westbrook, Jr.
Ralph Weymouth
Frank D. Whalen
George A. Whiteside
John E. Wicks, Jr.
Gordon B. Williams
Osborne B. Wiseman
Bernard M. Wolfe
Ernest W. Wood, Jr.
Richard H. Woodfin, Jr.
Edwin F. Woodhead
John F. Woodruff
Harry E. Woodworth
Robert K. R. Worthington
Arthur B. Yeates, Jr.
Frank A. Zimanski
Conrad J. Zimmer
Oswald A. Zink

MARINE CORPS

To be colonel

Harry L. Smith

To be lieutenant colonels

Oliver P. Smith
Henry D. Linscott

To be majors

Augustus H. Fricke
Julian N. Frisbie

To be captains

Luther S. Moore
Harry S. Leon
Nelson K. Brown

To be second lieutenants from the 2d day of June 1938

Robert W. Shaw	William P. Spencer
John A. Saxten, Jr.	Nathan T. Post, Jr.
Douglas E. Keeler	William A. Houston, Jr.
Carl J. Fleps	James J. Owens
George R. Newton	Alton D. Gould
Paul E. Becker, Jr.	Richard B. Church
Alfred L. Booth	John S. MacLaughlin, Jr.
Raymond H. George	John W. Howe
Carlo A. Rovetta	Howard B. Benge
Richard D. Weber	Clarke J. Bennett
Dorrance S. Radcliffe	Thomas L. Lamar
Charles M. DeHority	Hugh M. Elwood
Cyril E. Emrich	Randolph C. Berkeley, Jr.

To be chief pay clerk

Carlton L. Post

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 12 (legislative day of April 20), 1938

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Albert C. Schwarting, of Wisconsin, to be a Foreign Service officer, unclassified, vice consul of career, and secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1938

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, Thou who art the light of life, Thou who dost stoop from the stainless heights of purity, hear our petition, we beseech Thee. Knock at the door of every heart and seal it with Thy merciful presence. We pray Thee to keep us strong, just, and true with spiritual devotion and power. Stir our immortal spirits with a vision that shall conquer fears, transfigure disappointments, and immortalize our fondest hopes. Blessed Lord, may we walk in peace, free from the agitations and the surgings of these tumultuous times; keep us steadfast in self-discipline. Bless all homes and remember the little children who are growing into the years. May such influences be about them which shall lead them into the paths of virtue and truth. Harken unto all unvoiced hearts and loves which are never heard save by the ear of our All-Father. When this day dies into the dark, be pleased to give us rest. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10315. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to further promote the merchant marine policy therein declared, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House thereon, and appoints Mr. COPELAND, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. BAILEY, Mrs. CARAWAY, Mr. CLARK, Mr. McNARY, and Mr. GIBSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following concurrent resolution:

Concurrent Resolution 34

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 4276) to amend an act entitled "An act to create a juvenile court in and for the District of Columbia," and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House

is authorized and directed to renumber the sections beginning with section 26 so that the last section of the bill will be numbered 43, and to make necessary changes in references to sections.

RESIGNATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following notice of resignation:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 11, 1938.

HON. WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I beg to inform you that I have this day transmitted to the Governor of Kentucky my resignation as a Representative in the Congress of the United States from the Eighth District of Kentucky, effective May 12, at 10 o'clock a. m. eastern standard time.

With kindest regards,
I am truly,

FRED M. VINSON.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I report a privileged resolution, House Resolution 490, which I send to the Clerk's desk. The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 490

Resolved, That the President be requested to furnish the House of Representatives the names and addresses of all persons now employed by the National Labor Relations Board, the age of each person so employed, the place of birth of each person, where last employed and by whom, the rate of pay received from the former employer, and the rate of pay now being received as an employee of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HON. CORDELL HULL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I read in the Washington Star last night a rumor to the effect that the Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, was threatening to resign. I note with great relief a complete denial of that rumor in the Washington Post of this morning.

Because of the record of the Secretary of State, because of the fundamental principles of international relations announced by him, because of the thoughts expressed by him in his Press Club speech, and because of his work for reciprocal-trade agreements, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on his activities as Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. On many occasions I have said that the best way to keep America out of war would be for the treaty-observing nations of the world to cooperate in bringing moral and economic pressure to bear on the aggressors of today. The principles of world peace enunciated by Secretary Hull and his speech to the Press Club make it impossible for me to believe that the Secretary is in favor of an isolation policy for America. Believing this, then, I believe he should remain the head of the State Department.

It is my firm conviction that public opinion in America today is in favor of peaceful cooperation to end war, and against America's continued cooperation with Hitler and Mussolini in their invasion of Spain. Some say that only the left wingers in America are in favor of lifting the Spanish embargo. I feel sure that the Secretary of State does not take such a charge any more seriously than the charge deserves.

Because I feel that the Secretary of State is thinking right on the subject of world peace, I hope he remains in his present position. I shall continue to hope this until I am convinced that he is not thinking right.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 4199, the General Welfare Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL OLD-AGE PENSIONS AND THE GENERAL WELFARE ACT

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of national old-age pensions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to briefly add to the many speeches that have been made and the mass of material that has been offered during this Seventy-fifth Congress by 150 Members of this body who have urged consideration and enactment into law of H. R. 4199, known as the General Welfare Act.

The fight to secure recognition and consideration for the General Welfare Act has been a discouraging and uphill one through this whole Congress. There is room for just criticism of legislative rules that deny more than one-third of the membership the privilege of having considered legislation that they sponsor. There are more than 150 Members of the House of Representatives, and included in this movement is the entire delegation from the State of Washington, who have been doing everything in their power to bring to the floor of the House for consideration H. R. 4199, the General Welfare Act.

It is perplexing to us who see the wisdom and believe in the justice of H. R. 4199, as it was introduced by Congressman CROSBY, of Pennsylvania, in the early days of this Congress, to be brought to the realization that we are going to be denied the opportunity of even having a hearing on the bill and bringing it out on the floor for consideration.

MUST HAVE UNIVERSAL NATIONAL OLD-AGE PENSION

I have always felt that nothing short of a national old-age pension was workable in this country. I have likewise always felt that the simplest form of common justice, which all Americans so love, requires and demands that there be a national old-age pension, and that it be in the largest sum that can be paid consistent with our national economy. The operation of the social-security law in administering the old-age assistance provisions in cooperation with the States has clearly demonstrated to all of us that we cannot have 48 varying and discriminating old-age pension systems. It is resulting in making human suffering and misery a political football in every State and county election throughout the Nation.

I am sure the combined membership of this Congress, if it were permitted to have hearings and an open and free discussion on the floor of the House, would work out a tax formula that would in the end prove a blessing to all people in this country and would bring happiness, comfort, and peace into the lives of the millions of fine old folks where today we find sorrow, misery, and despair.

CONGRESSMEN SOMETIMES FORGET

It is unfortunately too easy sometimes for Members of Congress to forget the real pictures of discouragement, poverty, and social injustice that prevail in their home districts when they are removed many miles from them. These pictures, however, are so real to me that irrespective of where I might go or where I might be, or what surroundings might exist, I shall never forget them. These sad pictures are painted indelibly upon my mind from the many experiences that I had during the 10 years before coming to Congress, while I was a judge of the Superior Court of the State of Washington. We must correct the social and economic wrongs that created them.

ALWAYS CHAMPIONED OLD-AGE PENSIONS

When I came to Congress in January 1937 I came with a firm resolve to work for and aid in bringing about the enactment into law of the principles of a national old-age pension which had their origin in the Townsend movement, and which principles were expressed concretely in the second McGroarty bill, and later were more fully and completely written into the General Welfare Act, introduced by Congressman CROSBY, of Pennsylvania.

When the Ways and Means Committee indicated that they would not grant hearings on H. R. 4199, I was among the first to sign the discharge petition of Congressman HARRY SHEPPARD, of California, which petition now has 123 names upon it, and which, if it would receive 218 names, would automatically bring the bill on the floor for debate and consideration. I was likewise named as one of the steering committee of 40 Congressmen to work to bring this bill out on the floor, and I am still actively working with that committee. I also joined with 154 Congressmen in signing the petition and letter addressed to Chairman DOUGHTON, of the Ways and Means Committee, insisting that the committee, of which he is chairman, grant a hearing on H. R. 4199. I have worked in every way that I could to get consideration for this all-important piece of legislation, and it is, indeed, disappointing to be compelled to admit that the situation does not look at all hopeful.

PRINCIPLES AND NOT PERSONALITIES ARE ALL IMPORTANT

There are many reasons that might be given as to why we have not been able to have the principles of the General Welfare Act enacted into law. There have been objections made to certain features of it, and unfortunately a few of those original proponents have stood adamant against any change, even though more than 90 percent of the Congressmen who favor this legislation were willing that amendments be made to the bill. I have taken the position at all times that it is principles that we are concerned with and not details. There have been unfortunate differences of opinion between groups sponsoring old-age pensions, and this has retarded progress tremendously. I have also taken the position that personalities and individualities must not be allowed to hinder consideration and enactment into law the principles of this legislation. Unhappily, a few unscrupulous persons have actually made a money-making racket of old-age pensions.

On the other hand, there has been much unselfish and generous work for H. R. 4199 by individuals here who are not concerned with making money out of their activities or winning personal fame nor denouncing any other group or groups, but who are working unselfishly and untiringly to bring about the enactment of the bill into law with or without amendments.

WORKERS OUTSIDE OF CONGRESS

Undoubtedly, the outstanding individual, outside the Members of Congress, who has carried on quietly, tactfully and convincingly, and who has accomplished perhaps more than any other person during the Seventy-fifth Congress to win support for H. R. 4199, is Arthur L. Johnson, the man who wrote the General Welfare Act, and in writing it, found it necessary to add some 300 amendments to the second McGroarty bill, all of which won the approval of Dr. Francis E. Townsend. He has not insisted upon any pride of authorship but has been willing to listen to reason and accept modifications for further amendments. When Congressman BOILEAU, of Wisconsin, one of the veteran Progressive leaders of the House, suggested a series of amendments that would preserve the principles of the original act, and make it more workable, he accepted them, and this fact brought many new supporters. I firmly believe that if all groups and leaders in the old-age pension movement had shown the same fine spirit of cooperation, we would have had action upon the General Welfare Act long ago, or at least would have begun to remedy the terrible wrongs that we have allowed to grow up by which security and justice are denied to the old people, who are veterans of 40 years of struggle in making America both materially and spiritually, the greatest Nation on earth.

It is deeply to be regretted that there have been instances, perhaps few in number, where persons have gone about the country giving lip service to the cause of old-age pensions, but doing so only at a lucrative income to themselves. It was brought to my attention recently that one official in an old-age pension movement who had no property whatever 2 years ago, now lives in comfort and luxury, has purchased a fine new home and drives a splendid automobile, all of which represents contributions in the form of nickels and dimes from trusting, kindly, and deserving old people who gave them, believing that they were furthering a great humanitarian cause. It is such individuals that have set back the movement beyond calculation. To offset this fact, there are in every section of the land splendid men and women who have given unstintingly of their time and money to further the high ideals expressed in the General Welfare Act. I have in mind, particularly such men as the Honorable George A. Hormel, of California, head of the great Hormel Packing Co. What a marvelous example he has set for other industrialists in America. I also have in mind such tireless workers as Otto Case, former treasurer of the State of Washington.

AMERICA HAS GREAT POTENTIAL PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

Mr. Speaker, I said a little while ago that we were a great and rich country. We can afford to absolutely guarantee to every American irrespective of what accumulation of wealth he may have, if any, when he reaches the age of 60, that upon retiring from gainful employment at any time thereafter, he shall receive a cash monthly pension, in such sum as a given tax, whether it be a gross income tax or transaction tax, will produce each month. In passing I might say that I prefer the gross income tax as a more workable formula for spreading our national annual production and creating consumer buying power. The gross income tax is easily ascertainable and easily collected. It would be paid at the end of each month by every person, firm or corporation in America subject to it and payment could be made at convenient places, perhaps the post offices. It then could be disbursed within a short time after collection, again at a minimum cost and would result in a direct pay-as-you-go pension program.

I make the above statement because all of us know that we have potential productive capacity in this country that would make what I have said possible, and would likewise give to every young man and woman in this Nation an opportunity to find a job, earn a living, and maintain individual independence.

Recently there appeared in a financial journal published in London, called the Sphere, a statement of our material wealth, and while it has been quoted a number of times, it is worth referring to again. In this statement we are informed that 6 percent of the world's area and 7 percent of its population are contained in the United States. We normally consume 48 percent of the world's coffee, 53 percent of its tin, 56 percent of its rubber, 21 percent of its sugar, 72 percent of its silk, 36 percent of its coal, 42 percent of its pig iron, 47 percent of its copper, and 69 percent of its crude petroleum.

We are further informed that the United States operates 60 percent of the world's telephone and telegraph facilities, and its citizens own 80 percent of the motor cars in use, and we operate 33 percent of the railroads. We produce 70 percent of the oil, 50 percent of the wheat and cotton, and 50 percent of all copper and pig iron and 40 percent of the lead and coal output of the whole world.

In addition to this, we possess more than \$11,000,000,000 in gold, which is over half the world's gold. Our purchasing power, if it is permitted free play, is greater than that of the 500,000,000 people in Europe and much larger than the billion people who live in Asia, and still we must shame-facedly admit we have one-third of our population "ill-clad, ill-housed, and ill-fed."

With this marvelous plant of production is it any wonder that many of us grow restless because we are not making the most out of it? Of course, we must change the rules which are our State and National laws so that existing evils and abuses will be eliminated. But in making those changes we

must preserve our richest heritage, which is constitutional government. Both of these conditions are being sought after by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. I believe that his efforts would be greatly accelerated by the enactment into law of the principles found in H. R. 4199. I am sure the enactment of the principles of the general welfare act would go a long way toward making it possible for us to bring into the fullest use our plant of production.

WILL ALSO NEED OTHER LEGISLATION

I realize that going along with such legislation there would likewise have to be legislation giving us complete governmental control of the money and credit of this Nation, and for that reason I was delighted to be one of the coauthors of a bill that would make the Government the owner of the 12 Federal Reserve banks. I realize, too, that we must enact legislation that will control the private monopolies set up through corporate structures that in many instances carry on their businesses without even the slightest regard to the welfare of the average American citizen.

WE MUST SOLVE THIS PROBLEM

Mr. Speaker, while I have been much discouraged at what appears to me to be the slow progress we have been making in our tremendous social and economic problems, I still feel that the situation is far from hopeless, and if we can unite upon primary objectives and cease to fight on matters that involve personalities and trifles, the millions of Americans who are as deserving as any generation that has ever lived and who are now in the evening of their lives will yet have an opportunity to see a grateful nation express its gratitude and permit them to go on to their journey's end freed from the old fears that come with undeserved poverty.

EMERGENCY RELIEF AND FEDERAL PUBLIC-BUILDINGS BILL

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 497.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 497

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 679, a joint resolution making appropriations for work relief, relief, and otherwise to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public works projects, and all points of order against said joint resolution are hereby waived. That upon the expiration of the general debate fixed by order of the House of May 4, 1938, the joint resolution shall be read by sections for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order any amendment offered by direction of the Committee on Appropriations. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. Speaker, this is a rule for the consideration of the relief bill. It is made necessary because of objection having been lodged against unanimous consent to consider the bill for amendment. The bill as reported by the Committee on Appropriations, of course, is not privileged. It is not a general appropriation bill.

This is an open rule permitting germane amendments by any Member. While it waives points of order, we understand there are no matters in the bill subject to a point of order, except possibly that the committee may desire to offer one amendment which might be subject to a point of order.

We are anxious to bring the bill to a final vote tonight. This anxiety grows out of the fact that about 200 Members of Congress desire to take the annual congressional trip to Boston this time. Furthermore, all expedition possible should be made to pass this legislation. I trust the consideration of the bill will be completed before we adjourn tonight, no matter how late we must stay with it. Several days debate on amendments would not contribute anything more enlightening than will one day's discussion,

any partisan or demagogic argument to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, who is more familiar with the subject matter of this bill than any other Member.

Mr. WOODRUM. Supplementing what the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules has stated about the desirability of completing the consideration of the bill today, I may say that I personally have no objection to going ahead tomorrow and Saturday with the bill, but the condition obtains that the gentleman has suggested, a good many Members of the House are anxious to leave the city, and if the consideration of the bill is not completed today it will have to go on tomorrow. Therefore, I just want to say that because it is going to be necessary in considering the bill under the 5-minute rule to adhere to the 5-minute rule, and because there have been 10 hours of general debate, the committee hopes very much that the membership of the House will be willing to remain present and cooperate in expediting the consideration of the bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I gladly yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. RAYBURN. I may say, Mr. Speaker, it is the intention to remain in session this afternoon or evening until the consideration of this bill is completed.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, who always takes such a sincere interest in relief proposals.

Mr. BOILEAU. The gentleman from Virginia said it would be necessary to adhere to the 5-minute rule. I presume some arrangement could be made whereby we would have liberal debate on bona fide amendments and restrict debate on so-called pro forma amendments. I sincerely hope there will be adequate opportunity for full debate on legitimate amendments that are offered.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I am sure that will be done.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. What amendment does the gentleman understand will be offered by the committee under the reservation to the committee to offer amendments not germane?

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I understood it was the amendment with reference to housing; but I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, who is familiar with the matter, as I am not, to give a more detailed answer.

Mr. WOODRUM. As the gentleman from New York, of course, knows, when the provision was inserted in the rule, the amendment the committee had in mind was the amendment with reference to the United States Housing Authority. Since that time, however, the Committee on Appropriations has favorably reported an amendment making available additional funds for the Rural Electrification Administration; and this amendment will be offered as a committee amendment under the power given in the rule.

Mr. TABER. As I understand, it is not contemplated to offer the housing amendment?

Mr. WOODRUM. It is not.

Mr. TABER. I may say I believe the bill should be thoroughly debated. I am prepared—and I understand the members of the minority are also prepared—to stay here as long as necessary to complete the consideration of the bill, either today or on tomorrow or Saturday. However, it is our contention that the bill should be thoroughly debated so the people may know just what is being put through.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped on yesterday to find time to address myself to the very interesting and at the same time disturbing provisions in the pending bill, so at this time under the rule I shall simply exercise the dual function of economizing on time and expediting the matter and refraining from lengthy discussion when the bill comes up under the 5-minute rule.

Oddly enough, this provision comes along at a time when we are about to observe the sixty-eighth anniversary of the adoption of the State constitution in the State of Illinois.

As I recall, it was on the 13th of November 1870 that our constitution was adopted by a State convention and on the 2d of July of the same year it was ratified by the people of the State. This makes the provisions in the pending bill all the more interesting to me.

Efforts, of course, have been made to amend that constitution from time to time. Some of them have been successful and some of them have failed, but when that constitution was adopted the people of the State of Illinois provided a twofold method of amending our constitution. The first one, of course, is by the convention method, but any activity or any proposal or any matter submitted by the convention must first be submitted to and ratified by the electors of the State before it becomes effective.

The other method was to adopt proposals by a two-thirds vote of both houses of the State legislature, and having done so, then to submit them to the electorate.

However, there was an added restriction in the constitution, namely, that only one proposal could be submitted at any one session of the legislature.

This constitution, as adopted and as amended by the people of the State of Illinois, is intact today, and in that constitution we find a provision that I believe will strike a response in the minds of a great many who have a similar condition in their State.

Article IX, section 13, of the Illinois Constitution provides as follows:

That no county, city, township, school district, or other municipal corporation shall be allowed to become indebted in any manner or for any purpose to an amount, including existing indebtedness, in the aggregate exceeding 5 percent of the value of the taxable property therein.

This provision was in the original constitution, and so our counties, our cities, our school districts, and our other municipal corporations cannot today by excessive expenditures or otherwise plunge those corporations into debt beyond the constitution limit of 5 percent of the taxable value therein.

This has been ratified by the people of the State of Illinois, and I think the words, "for any purpose" or "in any manner," are particularly noteworthy and worthy of emphasis, because they indicate the intent of the framers of the constitution, and I believe indicate the intent of the people in ratifying that constitution to put some restriction upon the spending activities of those officials who are guiding the destinies of our local municipal corporations.

Now, in view of this limitation in the constitution of my own State, let me direct your attention to that provision in the pending bill which is found on page 19, section 201, paragraph (e) of title II, which in substance provides that in the event that a constitutional limitation does exist which prevents a public body from participating in a loan and grant for public works, the Administrator, with the approval of the President, may advance money to such a body upon an agreement to pay back at least 55 percent of the money with interest over a period not exceeding 25 years.

When Mr. Ickes, the Secretary of the Interior and the Administrator of P. W. A., was before the committee, you will find recorded at page 376 of the hearings his idea of the method of operation in effectuating an agreement or a lease or a contract with local officials where a constitutional limitation exists, and in substance it provides for the investment by the Federal Government of 100 percent, no securities to be issued by the municipal corporation, and Uncle Sam to lease, or by agreement or otherwise to make these

facilities or projects available to such a locality, the repayment to be spread over a period of 25 years, and the interest to be figured in the amortization cost.

This proposal presents a very pertinent and interesting question to me. First of all, can this be considered a device for torpedoing our State constitutions and flouting the expressed will of the people? I am just posing the question because others are just as much interested as I. Would not the making of a lease or agreement by county or city officials be the acknowledgment of a debt and, if not, why have any agreement at all?

I am thinking of this in the light of the express language of the Illinois Constitution, which says they must not incur this debt in any manner or for any purpose, and if ever the English language was explicit, it is explicit in those words in indicating the intent of the people and the framers of the constitution to put these limitations upon public officials.

Now then, another question. Funds with which to make the amortized payments on such a lease or agreement would have to be obtained through current taxes, and would not the very first payment under such a lease or agreement be tantamount to the acknowledgement of a debt? If it is not a debt, how could the Federal Government enforce collection on such an agreement and what would prevent any municipal corporation from repudiating the obligation at any time? How could any group of officials who negotiate such an agreement bind officials who might succeed them? What would prevent any taxpayer from enjoining a city or county from making payment on such a lease or agreement or enjoining such officials from collecting and imposing taxes for such purpose on the ground that it is a device for contravening the spirit and purport of the constitution of the State?

Can any other interpretation be placed upon this provision in the bill than that it is a device to circumvent the State constitution by making projects available to communities which are now barred by the constitution from incurring greater debts, and if it is successful, does it not set a precedent for the adoption of other schemes and devices to avoid the State constitution and thus deliberately and wilfully negative the will of the people as expressed in the State constitution? If the Congress adopts this provision and becomes a party to the scuttling of State constitutions, by what morality or logic does it expect to defend the Federal Constitution against equally ingenious schemes and devices to set its provisions at naught? If one mandatory provision of a State constitution can be thus cleverly nullified by action of the Congress, then all or any provisions of such constitution can be voided and the whole scheme of dual sovereignty and separate powers at once become a hollow fiction. The Congress should think twice before it places approval on this provision of the bill.

The argument for the retention of this provision in the bill will be that distressed communities in need of help are now barred from such aid by the debt limit in the State constitution. That argument is beguiling enough, but the answer is that in view of the vast funds made available in this bill, it would be better to grant the money to such communities outright rather than to nullify and dismember the organic act of a State and set in motion the forces that might ultimately wreck the whole system of separate and divided powers between the State and Federal Governments.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes more.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will give some thought to this matter. It is interesting to me, and it disturbs me. I have no hard and fast notions upon it, but I do not want to be in a position of wilfully and deliberately scuttling, avoiding, or negating the provisions of the constitution of my own State, when by a little more generosity on the part of Congress and the Federal Government that can be avoided, and these distressed communities can also be served.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that this bill merely provides for a lease? The provision as to acquiring the property is tantamount to an option that the State or the county or the municipality has under the bill, to accept or reject in the future. In other words, it is a lease, with an option that is given to the State to accept or reject in the future.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In response to the gentleman, that presents a very emphatic question. First, whether or not the making of such a lease or agreement in the expectation that current taxes will be extended for the purpose of retiring the option will be construed by the courts as a debt, and, secondly, whether in view of this very explicit language, namely, that no municipality or corporation can exceed the debt limit in any manner or for any purpose, is so broad as to catch the thing up, and, finally, are not we projecting ourselves into a hole if any taxpayer goes into court and seeks to enjoin a city or county from extending taxes for the purpose of paying such an agreement? If so, then Uncle Sam, of course, is holding the bag and may have built a courthouse or a city hall or a recreational area or a park of some kind without any means of enforcing the obligation.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman fears that during the 25 years such an option will run, such municipality will not be in a position to have sufficient funds to carry out the option, which is granted to it under the bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute more.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is to be expected, in view of the fact that Mr. Ickes testified that no securities are to be issued, that this will be paid out of the current revenues from time to time over the amortization period. What will then prevent the taxpayer from going in and enjoining the imposition of such a tax? Secondly, if, for instance, I, as a member of a city council, should vote for a project of this kind and impose that burden on the city, what will prevent the city council from simply accepting the work and still letting the Federal Government hold the bag?

Mr. SABATH. Then the Government would have the possession and the title to such property, because it is not intended that the title should pass until such municipality complies with and accepts the option granted in the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the question of title finally enter in when it becomes necessary to determine whether or not this is, in all good conscience and morals, a debt that is expected to be paid, although it comes within the prohibition of the State constitution? I do not know, but I will say that we are setting a precedent here. If we can do it once, we can do it twice; if we can do it twice, we can do it 10 times. It may be like the stone cast into the water; we can see the first ripples but we do not see the ripples that go way out to the distant shore line; and I am not so sure but what the precedent we are setting in motion by a provision of this kind may be dangerous in the future.

Mr. SABATH. I appreciate the gentleman's interest and I realize that he is well posted and means well to protect the Government. I know he desires at the same time to be liberal and make it possible for every municipality to obtain needed improvements and betterments which they are seeking and which will create employment for those now unemployed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My personal opinion is that it would be a good investment to give them the money outright rather than take the chance of setting a precedent of this kind. It is a matter for each man to determine for himself, because probably two-thirds or three-quarters of the States are confronted with this identical condition today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, we have under consideration a rule made necessary because of the character of

this legislation which contains both appropriations and legislation for a work-relief program.

I have been in favor of this program of the Federal Government taking the lead in giving relief to the unemployed because of the necessity that has arisen under the depression and which still exists. It became apparent in the early days of this administration that the Federal Government would have to take the lead in this program for relief of those who were in destitute circumstances and unemployed. The States and municipalities had broken down and exhausted their treasury and it was necessary to take care of the hungry, the unemployed, and the destitute by a program that is constructive in character. The problem became national and still requires Federal treatment.

There is nothing new about a program of helping those who are unemployed, although perhaps each age or generation may have to take it up in a new form. In the decades following the Civil War there was unemployment. We had a large public domain. Millions of acres of land were given to the railroads as a subsidy, and construction work went on in all parts of this country which gave an outlet for the unemployed. The Federal Government by those grants took the lead. That outlet for employment no longer exists. The public domain has been exhausted. If the Federal Government takes the lead today it must be in the nature of substantial construction of public works that will give the outlet for the unemployed and the relief that is needed.

There is danger to organized government in having millions of unemployed. Other countries have been faced by this situation as well as our own. These people become restless, they seek to overthrow the Government. The best thing the Federal Government can do in this period of depression is to take care of those who are out of employment and give them an opportunity to earn a livelihood, to save their homes, to support their families. If we want to preserve representative democracy, and I am sure we all do, we must follow some such program as this.

We had all hoped that the Federal Government could withdraw from this field of unusual expenditures, but unemployment is still widespread and the necessity is still great. Communities and States have shared in these grants and these appropriations. Each Congressman has had these projects in the communities in his district. These projects arise by planning committees in every county and go up through the planning committees through the State, receive the approval of the State, and then come to the Federal Government for approval. If any local community desires to withdraw it may, and assume the responsibility that has been theirs before this depression came. It has always been the responsibility of the local community to take care of the poor and the unemployed, and it is only because of the necessities of the situation that they no longer could do it that the Federal Government has thrown its credit and its powers and its wealth behind the local communities.

During this period that we have assisted the local communities and municipalities with Federal aid they have been reducing their debts in many instances until they stand today much better off in some States than they have been for a long time; they have paid off their local indebtedness and obligations while the Federal Government has assisted them, and they are now in better financial condition than they were some 4 or 5 years ago. In addition, most of these appropriations go into substantial improvements, the construction of public buildings, school buildings, the building of highways, and other permanent improvements. These things are not for the minute, for the hour, or for the day; they will last to benefit future generations. Every locality in the United States, therefore, has been benefited. These projects represent capital investments, not only in contentment to the citizenship, but giving them employment, substantially better buildings and improvements in their communities, which are not lost.

Much of the money contained in this is of self-liquidating character. It goes to the farm security for loans to those who will be placed in a better position to earn a livelihood.

Much of it will go to rural electrification to help the farmers have the benefits of modern improvements, the same as their neighbors in the city. This will become an outlet for the purchase of electrical equipment which will help to turn the wheels of the factories of our Nation and give employment in the industrial centers.

Some of the public works are 100 percent self-liquidating. Some of them are covered by grants which will be 50 or 55 percent self-liquidating. These do not substantially increase the public debt.

I know we have all been more or less distressed and alarmed over the increase in our national debt when we had all hoped that by this time we might withdraw from the field and begin a period of liquidation. But, after all, I wonder if America, in comparison with other nations that have gone through the distress of a depression, realizes in just what position this country is as compared with many nations of the world. I am not advocating that we ought to be in debt as much as some other nations, but I do say that the United States with its great wealth and resources cannot afford to refuse to do for its citizenship who are in distress what other nations who are in a less favorable condition have already done for their people.

We all have our regret that we spent such a great amount of money for the World War without the returns that are now visible. In 1919 following the World War we owed in round figures twenty-seven and one-half billion dollars. Against that was offset cash on hand of \$1,118,000,000 and Finland's debt, \$8,270,138, which is the only one listed in this article that can be considered worth 100 cents on the dollar, which made total assets of \$1,126,000,000 which could then be offset against our Federal indebtedness. We had a net debt if we strike off tangible resources of \$25,470,000,000. At that time we had about 105,000,000 population and the per capita debt was \$242. I am speaking of the Federal debt now. That is for each man, woman, and child in the United States. That was in 1919.

On April 5, 1938, this statement which I think is authentic makes a comparison. Our Federal debt was thirty-seven and one-half billion dollars, but against that we have a right to take credit for tangible assets, the same as if we owed \$5,000 at the bank and had property or money in the bank which we could offset against our debt. We could figure our net debt was less. So against the thirty-seven and one-half billion dollars we had cash on hand of \$1,907,000,000. We had in the stabilization fund \$1,800,000,000. We had in gold in the vaults in Kentucky and other places upon which there had been no issue, \$1,182,000,000. This makes a total of tangible assets, including cash, the stabilization fund and gold, of \$4,800,000,000. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation had obligations which were worth 100 cents on the dollar and which are being liquidated with small loss, of \$4,900,000,000 and we still have Finland's debt, which I am carrying at \$8,000,000 plus, and this is worth 100 cents on the dollar. We have tangible credits in money and in securities that are being collected at the rate of 100 cents on the dollar, a total of \$9,843,000,000, which makes our national debt today \$27,000,000,000 plus. We now have a population of 130,000,000 plus. Our per capita debt is \$213, or approximately \$30 less than it was at the end of the World War. The debt of this Nation, although higher than we might desire, is nowhere near the danger mark. It is about one-tenth of our national aggregate wealth.

Furthermore, our individual tax burden as measured by income and excise taxes are much lower than other leading nations.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Against that we have to take into consideration that our national wealth and resources have increased since 1919 many billions of dollars. The per capita debt and burden of liquidation is easier now than in 1919. There is no reason for alarm.

England has a per capita debt of about three times what America has, with assets and with a national wealth of only one-third of America. We have not begun to touch the resources of the United States and I hope we will not have to, but I say there is nothing alarming from the standpoint of our national debt, especially when we have to use that in order to help our unemployed, which is one of the purposes of a democracy; that is, to take care of its people in an hour of distress like this.

Resources owned by the Federal Government in public land, parks, timber, oil, mineral, public buildings, and securities for loans along with gold, silver, and miscellaneous resources are still greater than our total Federal debt.

There is no need for an alarm that will stampede our people from performing our duty to the underprivileged, the hungry, and the unemployed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. McFARLANE].

RADIO-MONOPOLY INVESTIGATION

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I made a statement before the Rules Committee this morning on the radio-monopoly investigation resolution, and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the statement I made before the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I would like the committee to understand that in appearing today I am not interested in the personnel of the Communications Commission as such. My interest in radio has been concerned entirely with the existence of a radio monopoly, which, I believe, will be admitted is a menace to the free institutions of America. It has been my thought for sometime to present to the House certain information, including data in affidavit form, which conclusively suggests the existence of a criminal conspiracy which not only debauched a large corporation, persons holding high public offices, but also certain court officials. I have been in doubt as to whether to move impeachment proceedings or to await action on the part of this committee.

The information I refer to concerns the payment of money in cash to elected representatives of the people for interference with the activities of the Department of Justice, activities which brought forth a consent decree from a district court. This action benefited officials of this radio corporation dependent for its existence upon the gratuitous radio licenses which it has received from the Government of the United States.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have checked the contents of this affidavit in two separate manners, and while I have not made nor been in a position to make the type of an investigation which is necessary, I want to say that both checks verified the statements made in the affidavit. That a monopoly exists there can be no doubt. You, Mr. Chairman, on the floor of Congress, admitted that you knew such monopoly existed. All 40 clear channels, almost all regional high-power stations, almost all radio stations that extend beyond the jurisdiction of one community are owned, controlled, or operated in the interest of, or by the radio monopoly.

An illustration of the legal highjacking indulged in by this particular corporation is evidenced by the manner in which they blackjacked the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., another monopoly, into permitting them to share the profits of the sound motion-picture field.

I have here a photostatic copy of the bill of complaint wherein the attorney for R. C. A. printed a bill of complaint alleging monopoly and illegal restraint of trade on the part of the A. T. & T., and instead of filing it in the courts as was presumably intended, sent it to the attorneys for the A. T. & T. Co., which resulted in the attorneys for both monopolies agreeing to share the field. The allegations of monopoly and restraint of trade contained in this photostatic copy of the bill of complaint prepared for use of R. C. A. is just as true today in the case of telephone, as it was and is today in the case of R. C. A.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a very exhaustive financial analysis of the financial set-up and condition of R. C. A. as of May 28, 1936.

The signer of this document is recognized as competent and has or had a good standing in the financial world. His work was considered so sufficiently good that following this analysis of R. C. A., I understand, that Mr. Sarnoff, who in this report is indicted most severely as incapable and inefficient, has hired him as a financial analyst for R. C. A. This auditor's report indicates that R. C. A. officials have defrauded common-stock holders to an extent of millions of dollars; have issued false financial re-

ports to stockholders and to the public; have paid preferred-stock holders dividends of \$28,000,000 on earnings of only \$11,700,000; that 6,580,375 shares of stock with a value at date of issue of \$290,000,000 were issued to General Electric and Westinghouse for assets stated to have been worth \$39,900,000. This \$39,900,000 was subsequently written down to some \$24,000,000; that preferred stock with redemption value of \$80,000,000 and an annual dividend rate of more than \$4,000,000 was issued by R. C. A. in consideration of some \$17,000,000. That dividends have been paid on preferred stock when the corporation's earnings had been dissipated and prior surplus had been wiped out and capital impaired to the extent of some \$16,000,000.

This report also shows that R. C. A. issued 2,000,000 shares of stock to General Electric and Westinghouse in supposed consideration of a valuable exclusive contract. When R. C. A. put over the infamous so-called consent decree in the Federal court at Wilmington, November 21, 1932, they found it necessary to cancel this agreement. But there is no indication that the 2,000,000 shares of stock issued in consideration of this supposed valuable agreement has ever been returned to R. C. A. for their stockholders.

This most unusual procedure on the part of a concern for the benefit of its preferred-stock holders surely warrants looking into on the part of the Congress.

Incidentally this report discloses there are more than 200,000 shareholders of R. C. A.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the facts and statements herein referred to will astound many Members of Congress. The information given has been in my possession for sometime, and I have made every effort to have the Congress investigate this monopoly and the debauchery brought forth by it without making public these affidavits. I realize that we are in the closing days of this session of Congress, and I feel it my duty to the public to bring this matter, as I am doing, before the Rules Committee at the first opportunity I have had for your consideration. I realize fully that failure on my part to do so would permit those who know I possess this information to indict me for my failure to live up to my oath of office.

If you want to understand this radio racketeering situation better, I recommend that you read carefully a recently published book entitled "Television; a Struggle for Power," by Frank C. Waldrop and Joseph Borkin. In it you will find an astounding story of patent racketeering, suppression of inventions, monopolistic abuses of power, and a forecast, based on the history of the steals in radio and telephony, of what may be expected in television, the newest development in the communications field.

Members of the committee, let me urge you to give this radio investigation resolution your immediate and favorable consideration to the end that the molding of public opinion in this country will be honestly and fairly protected for all the people.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I do not see how any thoughtful mind can contemplate the situation confronting us this morning without feelings of deep anxiety. Having spent nearly \$50,000,000,000 in the past 5 years, the New Deal administration is now asking the taxpayers to put up five billions more in the vain hope that the spending of five billions now will do what the Government spending of fifty billions has failed to do, namely, restore American business to a normal condition and put 12,000,000 unemployed back to work. The inevitable results of this insane spending spree are so fraught with danger and disaster to the lives and liberties of our people that intelligent men and women everywhere, regardless of party affiliation, are deeply disturbed.

Yesterday morning at the beginning of the debate, which has become notable, someone raised the question of whether this proposal was to be considered as an opiate or a blood infusion. If it is to be considered as an opiate, of course, the chief surgeon, Dr. Roosevelt, will have charge, and his internes, Dr. Hopkins and Dr. Farley, will continue to see that the opiate reaches the patient in proper doses before the election in November. If a blood infusion is made, of course, the taxpayer will, as always, have to furnish the blood.

In the few minutes allotted to me I wish to refer to a statement made by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM], who asked this question:

If we had not appropriated the countless billions at the beginning, what could the President or anybody else have done?

That was the essence of his question. A question coming from that gentleman always appeals to me as worthy of serious attention, because I have the profoundest respect and affection for him as one of the outstanding men in the Congress of the United States. I should like to give my answer to that question.

When Mr. Roosevelt was elected and came to office at a time of great depression he had back of him a support such as no other President of the United States has ever known. He had behind him both political parties. He was elected on a platform that, in my judgment, is one of the soundest platforms ever written by a political party in the history of this Nation. The people of the country were united in looking to him as the man to lead them out of the darkness of depression. If he had followed the original and oft-repeated expression of his views and had, on taking office, announced to the Nation and to the world that he accepted, without reservation, the American principle and method of life, namely, that the problems of our economic existence should be solved by the activities of the people themselves and not by the Government, he could have called to his side the farmer, the labor leader, the industrialist, the banker, the teacher, the college man, and the women of the country and, pooling our wisdom and our fundamental belief that we could solve that problem in the American way, he would have ushered in then, I believe, a period of prosperity based upon the eternal principles of the American way of life that would never have been equaled in the history of the world.

He began well. We all supported him. I personally voted for every proposal he made in the first months of his administration and was glad to do it. But by and by a mysterious change overtook him. There came flying into Washington from the four corners of the country, like crows to a dead horse, strange amorphous creatures, each of them seized and possessed of a complete and entirely different solution for every economic problem in the world. The majority Members of this Congress, charged under the Constitution with the responsibility of leading the people of the country in the administration of their public affairs, were shoved to one side and reduced to the ignominious status of mere rubber stamps for the Executive will; and these mysterious New Deal creatures have been roosting near the administration ever since and infecting it with their views, most of them impractical, un-American, and alien. The result has been that the industrial economy of America has been prevented from becoming once more the instrument for solving the problem of unemployment. I recognize that this problem contains one element, the unemployables, which cannot be solved by putting people to work. In England this element has been reduced to the smallest possible compass. The unemployables have been put to one side. The fact has been recognized that they must be supported, and out of the product of the toil and brains of the English people their support comes. We should have done that. And if we had massed the intellectual, moral, and financial resources of this Nation with the governmental authority to guide and regulate and not to punish and prohibit, I believe that today, instead of wearing crape and mournfully bartering away the last of the people's hard-earned money, this Nation would be an example to the world in its successful solution of the economic problem of unemployment and in the great prosperity of the masses of our people.

Therefore, I feel that the answer to the question raised by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia is that if Mr. Roosevelt had deliberately and consistently, with all his wonderful powers of leadership, chosen the American way and stuck to it, we would have been out of this depression long ago. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I cannot refuse to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman tell us just exactly what he means by that statement? I should be delighted if he would.

Mr. EATON. Will the gentleman tell me exactly what he means by that question?

Mr. KELLER. Yes. I refer to the last statement the gentleman made, "if this had been done in the American way." I should like to know what the gentleman's idea of the American way is, that is all.

Mr. EATON. Well, the gentleman would not understand it. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I hate to be tortured this way, but I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Did President Hoover use the American way during the 4 years previous?

Mr. EATON. Oh, my, what a blessing Hoover is as an alibi.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is a plain question.

Mr. KELLER. Will not the gentleman try it out for me and let me try? I shall be glad to try.

Mr. EATON. Try what? Will the gentleman kindly tell me what he is talking about?

Mr. KELLER. The gentleman made the statement that this had not been done in the American way, and if it had been done in the American way we would be in a state of prosperity. If the gentleman would be specific and tell me what he means by the American way it would enlighten me very much and I would appreciate it very much.

Mr. EATON. If I have a chance to enlighten the gentleman I am going to take it, because he needs it.

Mr. KELLER. Right.

Mr. EATON. The American way is the way outlined in the Democratic platform of 1932. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLER. All right, go ahead.

Mr. EATON. I do not need to go any further than that. That settles it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. It would also have been the American way if they had carried out the platform of 1932, and the promises they made before election and had stuck to them instead of doing the opposite of what they said they would do. That is the American way of telling the truth.

Mr. EATON. I hope the gentleman from Illinois has paid attention to the last speaker.

Mr. KELLER. I listened very attentively, but I should like to know why the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from Pennsylvania both supported the administration, and now turn around and say it was all wrong.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. Yes.

Mr. COX. Is not the American way the placing of emphasis upon the liberties of the citizen rather than upon the power and the glory of the State?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. EATON. Exactly so. I have a document here and I shall ask for enough time to present certain facts set forth therein.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. EATON. This is what I mean by the un-American way.

Mr. KELLER. I would like to know the American way.

Mr. EATON. The American way which the gentleman intimates he does not know was the way of the Jeffersonian Democrats for all time, and the way of the regular Republicans. The way of constitutional government of laws and not of men. The way of an independent Congress and judiciary free from Executive domination. The way of elections unbought by taxpayers' money. The way of a free people whose government is their servant and not their master. That is the American way, not the New Deal way.

This is what happened. Instead of the New Deal encouraging business, business was hamstrung, pilloried, and punished as an evil thing. Instead of recognizing that the fundamental interests of labor and capital, of employer and employee are identical and can only be safeguarded and advanced by mutual understanding and cooperation, we had the Wagner Act and the National Labor Relations Board by means of which this administration placed American labor on a war basis with American industry by law.

The president of the National Dairy Products Corporation told his stockholders at their annual meeting in New York on April 21, first, that in 1937 the company made 11,115 separate tax reports, one every 15 minutes of every business day of the year, at a cost of \$265,000.

Second, that reports of all kinds totaled 75,000 and cost \$1,000,000.

Third, that one Government agency's request contained 5,000 questions.

The taxes of the company were running 23 percent this year over what they were last year.

Now, how can any American business exist with a bunch of little interrogation points here in Washington sending out bureaucratic questionnaire after questionnaire? How can any business function when it has to spend its time consulting its lawyers instead of developing the best interests of the business based on sound economic principles?

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON. No; I cannot yield. I just want to be on record as facing the situation today with the same feeling of depression and anxiety that disturbs the majority of Members of this House. It is evident that soon we are going to have a debt of forty-five or fifty billion dollars. It is equally certain that the wealth-producing agencies of the Nation will be bled white by unnecessary taxation. Unless we change our ways and take hold of this problem and put to work the constructive forces of American civilization instead of continuing to destroy these vital forces by means of alien-minded, wasteful, unproductive, punitive legislation, the given fact is that like the swine in the Scriptures, bedeviled and bedamned, we are going over the precipice.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia sounds a warning that if we are going to complete the consideration of this bill tonight it may be necessary to adhere rigidly to the 10-minute rule on each amendment. The gentleman very properly states, and I commend him for it, he is willing to stay here tomorrow or Saturday in order to thoroughly debate the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have only 2 minutes. If the gentleman can get me an extra minute, I will yield.

I believe that is exactly what should be done. This is the most important bill that will come before the Congress this year, and, consequently, I think it should be thoroughly debated.

There are a number of items in this bill which cannot be justified and the Membership of this House should have an opportunity to speak upon these proposals.

I appreciate the inspiration which would come to Congressmen by visiting Concord and Lexington and Bunker Hill. There they would drink the patriotism of old Massachusetts which has been a dominant factor in the building of the Nation. However, our first duty is to the people of the United States right now in this critical hour, and we should pass up pleasure trips and devote our attention to our real work. I believe every Republican is willing to do this, and I hope the gentleman will adopt the attitude he has expressed and see that the bill is debated thoroughly.

I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM. I was just going to say to the gentleman that I did not say 10 minutes on each amendment. I referred to the 5-minute rule, which means 5-minute speeches. I think on an important amendment there might be a reasonable number of pro forma amendments on which speeches could be made, but what I wanted was adherence to the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is willing to sit here even if the consideration of the bill may go into tomorrow?

Mr. WOODRUM. I am not only willing to stay, but we are going to stay here until we finish the bill, whether it is today or tomorrow or Saturday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And the gentleman is willing to give us every opportunity to debate the bill?

Mr. WOODRUM. We shall be as liberal as possible. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended taking any more time of the committee or of the House, except for the temptation always to follow the distinguished and attractive gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], who always speaks with great interest and usually with wisdom and logic. The gentleman could not come today with his great warm heart and his love of humanity and really make a speech which would condemn this bill. So he just scattered out over the universe and proceeded to dip his oar in again with these other gentlemen who have just sought to smear over anything that was suggested here by the party in power; and, of course, when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER] asked my good friend a very impertinent and embarrassing question as to what he meant by the American way, my good friend fished around in his pocket for a while and got out something that looked like a Chinese laundry ticket and proceeded to read what some Republican editor somewhere had said about the New Deal.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there for a correction?

Mr. WOODRUM. Gladly.

Mr. EATON. What I produced was not a Chinese laundry ticket but one of the immortal documents of the ages—the Democratic platform of 1932.

Mr. WOODRUM. I commend the gentleman for carrying good literature in his pocket. What has been done since President Roosevelt went into the White House is just exactly what the gentleman says ought to be done. He has tried to meet the problems of America in an American way. That is what he has done—not in the Harding way, not in the way of the golden age of Calvin Coolidge, not in the timid way of Herbert Hoover, but in an American, realistic way, where men are not afraid to look problems in the eye and have the courage to try to solve them.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I have only a few minutes, and in a little while I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

The criticism of the gentleman from New Jersey is that we ought to do it in the American way. That is very specific, is it not? It is just as specific as the observation made by my beloved friend from Georgia [Mr. Cox] when he came into the situation. That distinguished gentleman said that we ought to put the emphasis on the liberty of the citizens instead of the glory of the States—that that is what we ought to do. What we have done in the program heretofore has been to try to bring relief to distressed American citizens, relief to business, relief to banks, relief to railroads, relief to individuals, and that was fairly and reasonably accomplished, and the ship of state was and is now, if you please, upon the high road of recovery.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOODRUM. In just a few moments; yes. However, little winds came, and the ship slowed down, and what we are doing today is sending it forward again, and we are doing it in the American way, and the overwhelming majority of the American people are in favor of doing it in this way.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. WOODRUM. In just a few moments. What does this bill do? It undertakes to obligate the credit of the richest nation on the face of the earth for a little less than \$2,000,000,000 to try to meet the problem when ten or twelve million unemployed men are asking for work. What is the American way to do that? Is it to shut the door in their faces and send them to the park benches and on the railroad tracks? What is the American way? Is it to turn them out hungry, cold and shelterless and let their homes be sold?

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WOODRUM. In just a moment.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean that the American way is to provide no employment except relief employment?

Mr. WOODRUM. Oh, the gentleman and his party since we have been considering this bill met in solemn conclave and decided to try to defeat the bill. Did the gentleman's party not do that? I pause to give the gentleman an opportunity to say. Did they not meet right in this Chamber since we have considered this measure and was not the only contribution it had to make, to agree to try to defeat the bill?

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield for an answer?

Mr. WOODRUM. In just a moment. The only contribution the gentleman's party had was to try to defeat the provisions of this bill.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman yield there?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. TABER. We met to offer a program that would bring about recovery.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is the American way, according to these gentlemen. It is to defeat this bill, and I am anxious to see how many of them will vote against it when the time comes. I am anxious to see how many will vote against the bill, which is the only opportunity to give employment to the men in your districts who are asking for a right to work. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I usually follow the gentleman, and I am not sure but I am following him now. I know the gentleman feels that whatever expenditures are made under this bill, there should be some spreading out of expenditures so as to cover the entire situation. The gentleman no doubt agrees to that statement, but I wonder what explanation he is in a position to make to the fact that this bill provides for an expenditure of more money in the State of Pennsylvania than in every Southern State combined.

Mr. WOODRUM. I do not think that is a fair statement in the first place. I do not think it does.

It does provide for more money to be spent in the centers of unemployment, because that is where the need is. There is not a man in my district who is going to be moved out on the sidewalks and stay there all night in the weather. He and his family are not going to starve. I venture to say, however, that there will be such cases of hardship and suffering in the great metropolitan centers.

Mr. COX. By the same token the people in the gentleman's district have supported themselves on a great deal less than we give to those on relief in the metropolitan centers.

Mr. WOODRUM. That may be so. The bill is designed to afford relief where the need exists, and the provisions are elastic enough to take care of differentials in living costs.

Mr. FORD of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. FORD of California. As I understand the definition of the phrase "American way" by the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle it means the liberty to starve.

Mr. WOODRUM. No; the "American way," according to our Republican viewpoint, is anything except what the Democratic Party offers to do. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADULT EDUCATION

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, in my State of New York the W. P. A., through the adult-education program, has brought incalculable benefits to thousands. This new appropriation will mean the continuation and further extension of this program.

Fear that the program would be discontinued has brought me hundreds of letters from students in the various classes imploring me to do my utmost to insure its continuation.

Their letters are a revelation, and I ask permission to read a few of them into the Record.

A student in the School for Adult Education in Yonkers writes:

May I present to you a picture of the part this school plays in the lives of so many hundreds of adults? Many of us have a limited education because years ago emphasis was not placed upon its value. A grammar-school graduate was supposed to be lucky, a high-school graduate held in awe, and a college graduate looked upon as one apart. Within the past 20 years, however, this condition has altered considerably. Very nearly everyone wants a high-school training, and college is the usual thing.

But the question of funds is still an unanswerable problem. Here the School for Adult Education has proven a godsend. It has made possible attainment of this training that is so necessary. It also prevents that hopelessness that attends prolonged inability to find employment; the knowledge that one is refreshing one's mind and learning new things is a stimulant that should not be withdrawn lightly from so many people who desperately need this activity to keep them from despair. The fact that for 3 hours each night, 5 nights a week if desired, this refuge and stimulant is to be had, has kept within the bounds of sanity who knows how many hundreds and thousands of men and women.

A Valley Stream, Long Island, student testifies:

The students in this school comprise the middle class—the taxpayers and backbone of the Nation. Many have secured jobs through the knowledge they have obtained. Others have bettered their position by refreshing and increasing their knowledge of a subject to the extent that they have been able to pass examinations at higher ratings.

This student says further, touching upon another angle of the program:

Most important of all benefits is that given to foreign-born residents of this community. These classes teach them to read, write, and speak English, the basis for true and loyal citizenship.

A teacher in one of these classes for the foreign born writes:

While the advanced classes may not suffer if the schools are closed temporarily, the beginners look upon closing as a genuine calamity. Those who are only beginning to read and write realize that in a few months without a teacher they would lose their start and have to begin all over again. These new arrivals need our help most urgently.

A vitally important phase of the work is touched upon in the following quotations from a few of the letters I have received:

We are most interested in the classes for physically handicapped children. Our Lillian is suffering from a heart ailment, although she hopes that in the near future she may be able to return to school. Her condition may be so improved that her desire will be granted in 2 years. The child did not obtain any instruction after being excluded from school until this project was established. Now our Lillian has completed 2 years' school work and is doing fourth-grade work. Her visiting teacher is very competent, and hopes that Lillian can soon be promoted to the fifth grade. I am asking you to have this work continued because the handicapped children need an education as badly as the more fortunate ones. I am not only speaking for my child but for hundreds of others. I am sure you will understand.

Plea that the work for handicapped children be continued is made by another mother in Bellmore.

I have profited greatly by having this teaching for my boy, who would not be able to get an education in any other way. The fact that he is taught at home is of great advantage, as he is not quick enough to keep up with a class.

Most of such children, another writer in Newburgh points out, would receive no education at all if the program was discontinued. Paying for medical care is about all the parents can afford. Education and training, except for the little an untrained mother can give, is out of the question. This writer refers to a specific case.

This child is only 6 years old and could never attend school because of physically handicapped lower limbs and a delicate body. She has had a teacher for 1 hour every day for a year. When the teacher first started her lessons she did not even know her letters. She can read and write, and has not only completed first-grade work but has started the second. Her parents are not in a financial condition to send her to private school or employ a tutor. Due to her ill health she must spend 5 hours every day in the sunshine, so you can see why she does not attend public school.

Another Newburgh writer speaks of her own child;

I have a little boy who has diabetes and is not able to attend school. If he has a few years of education at home and his condition improves we hope that he can then be placed in a class

suitable to his age, temporarily or permanently. Disabled children, such as my son, must, however, be given special training at home. It is very important for such a handicapped child to receive an education. Even more important than a physically able child. My son has had the visiting teacher for 6 months. During this time he has covered a year and a half of regular school. He is now in the second grade. If it were not for this project he would have had no instruction at all.

The dressmaking and millinery classes have been especially popular.

A student in a Roosevelt, Long Island, class writes:

It has been of great benefit to me. I have learned a great deal and I now make my own clothes. I also make my own hats since I learned how. My husband doesn't earn enough for me to buy clothes so I am saving money and looking well dressed by making them. I hope to learn designing, as I seem to have a talent for it.

A Yonkers business girl says:

I have been attending the tailoring and dressmaking classes and have found them to be most helpful. Home conditions do not permit me to buy clothes but through this instruction I have been able to make them, thus keeping up the appearance necessary for me to hold my position.

From Lynbrook a woman writes:

When I first joined the W. P. A. adult education sewing class I knew very little about sewing but under the excellent and patient guidance of my teacher I have been able to increase my own family's wardrobe tastefully and economically.

Syracuse reports on their sewing class:

Homemakers have benefited materially in coming to these classes. In our clothing classes alone we women have made garments at a saving of from one-half to two-thirds the price of the garments ready-made. This has made it possible for people who found their incomes reduced to properly clothe themselves and their children. Several women have told them that the savings they have been able to make have enabled them to keep their sons and daughters in college.

Our classes have benefited the community at large. Thousands of yards of new material have been sold by the local stores to women in our class. Notions, patterns, and even new sewing machines, have been purchased.

Classes in lip reading have proven wonderworkers for the hard of hearing. A student in a Floral Park class says:

Having attended these classes I know how much they are needed by people who are hard of hearing. These people are ordinary human beings but need special aid. They have all the other necessary qualifications for success for this one—hearing.

My letters have been numerous and I am only selecting at random but these beautifully illustrate the attitude of the students in every section of my State toward the work of the adult-education project:

Yonkers:

I have two nieces and a daughter who are taking courses in the Yonkers school. They are girls who have finished high school and in better times would have gone to college. But this is their only chance for further education.

Sea Cliff:

If it is necessary to give vocational training to young people to enable them to earn their living, then what about older people who have to learn new ways because of upset conditions? If they can become economically useful it is certainly better all around than to stagnate on relief.

In my classes there are women who have known little or nothing about sewing. They have learned to cut, to fit, and to make all kinds of clothing for themselves and members of their families. Since many of them are in straitened circumstances or even on relief, it is necessary for them to stretch a dollar to the limit and making their own clothes is an important help to that end. What is true in my classes is true in the other lines of instruction. This is a practical fact and not a case of boondoggling.

Also from Sea Cliff this letter was from an American Legion post:

This program has taken very strong hold in some of its phases in our surrounding community and has been of considerable help in forming groups that have become a part of our regular community life. Without the support of the Works Progress Administration in having teachers and instructors to properly conduct these classes and organizations, they are bound to fail for lack of proper leadership. Such groups where Americanism and American ideals are brought with such force before the eyes of our citizens should be continued.

Valley Stream:

I am unemployed and am taking these courses to keep up my typing and to learn new subjects. I am a college graduate.

I hold a State license to teach physical science but in the 3 years since I graduated from college I have not had even one day's work substituting. Unable to afford the expense of a secretarial school after working my way through college, I enrolled in the W. P. A. evening classes. Now I am on my way to attaining the necessary skill to obtain a clerical job.

Syracuse:

Save our project, millinery and sewing. You cannot imagine how much happiness they have given me and I think they should be made a permanent feature of our American life. It is a healthy sign to see people ambitious enough to keep up appearances for themselves and their families. Please do not deprive us of this little bit of pleasure and comfort.

Freeport, Long Island:

I am attending evening classes 2 nights a week in the village of Freeport and I can say honestly this work has helped me greatly. I never had the opportunity as a boy to receive a grammar-school education. Now I am married and with three children. All are attending grammar school and I find that I am better able to help them with their home work since I started to attend these evening adult classes.

Also Freeport:

These projects have done so much to further the education of ambitious men and women of our State, who, like myself, are married and have families and cannot afford to pay for such services.

Two years ago I knew nothing about stenography and typing and, feeling that it would be beneficial to me and the Postal Service, where I have been employed for 31 years, I took advantage of the adult-education program and enrolled. Through the fine cooperation and instruction that I have received I have been able to better my position in the Postal Service.

Hempstead:

These schools and classes are doing a wonderful job and filling a very real need. Many of the students are unemployed, anxious to acquire new skills or to improve old ones. Where the student is fortunate enough to be employed, in many instances there are so many dependents upon him, that there is nothing left for additional education or recreation.

Man cannot live by bread alone—while people attend classes primarily for training to suit their needs, they also enjoy the benefits which result from friendly contacts. This cannot be measured in dollars and cents. In spite of occasional headlines to the contrary there is nothing wrong with the youth of today. They do like to "belong" and the adult-education classes have made it possible for increasing numbers of young people to enjoy supervised study and recreation.

The surface has only been scratched along the lines of developing good citizens through adult education.

Syracuse:

Difficult as the situation is for those of younger years, no more pitiful situation exists than the plight of persons of mature years who find no opportunity for useful employment, while yet equipped and able to give valuable service in many lines. Adult education has been a godsend to many of these.

This work is needed, terribly needed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN and Mr. GRAY of Indiana asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

EMERGENCY RELIEF AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS BILL

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 679, making appropriations for work relief, relief, and otherwise to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 679, the emergency relief and public-buildings bill, with Mr. WARREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc.

TITLE I—WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF

SECTION 1. That in order to continue to provide work relief on useful public projects, and relief, in the United States and its Territories and possessions, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until June 30, 1939, as follows:

(1) To the Works Progress Administration, \$1,250,000,000, together with the balances of allocations heretofore made or hereafter

to be made to the Works Progress Administration under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937 which remain unobligated on June 30, 1938, and such amounts shall be available for (a) administration; (b) the prosecution of projects heretofore approved for such Administration under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, and the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937, which projects shall not be subject to the limitations (1), (2), and (3) of (d) hereof; (c) aiding self-help and cooperative associations for the benefit of needy persons; and (d) the following types of public projects, Federal and non-Federal, subject to the approval of the President, and the amounts to be used for each class shall not, except as hereinafter provided, exceed the respective amounts stated, namely: (1) Highways, roads, and streets, \$425,000,000; (2) public buildings; parks and other recreational facilities, including buildings therein; public utilities; electric transmission and distribution lines or systems to serve persons in rural areas, including projects sponsored by and for the benefit of non-profit and cooperative associations; sewer systems, water supply and purification systems; airports and other transportation facilities; flood control; conservation; eradication of insect pests; projects for the production of materials for fertilizing soil for distribution to needy farmers under such conditions as may be determined by the sponsors of such projects under provisions of State law; and miscellaneous construction projects, \$575,000,000; and (3) educational, professional, clerical, cultural, recreational, production, service, and miscellaneous nonconstruction projects, \$250,000,000: *Provided*, That the amount specified for any of the foregoing classes may be increased by not to exceed 15 percent thereof by transfer or retransfer of an amount or amounts from any other class or classes;

(2) To the Works Progress Administration for the National Youth Administration, \$75,000,000, together with the balances of allocations heretofore made or hereafter to be made to the Works Progress Administration for the National Youth Administration under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937 which remain unobligated on June 30, 1938, and such sums shall be available to provide, subject to the approval of the President, on projects of the types specified under (1) (d) hereof for the Works Progress Administration, part-time work and training to needy young persons who are no longer in regular attendance at school and who have been unable to obtain employment and to provide financial assistance through part-time employment on such projects for needy young persons to continue their education at schools, colleges, and universities;

(3) To the Secretary of Agriculture, \$175,000,000, together with balances of allocations heretofore made or hereafter to be made to the Farm Security Administration under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937 which remain unobligated on June 30, 1938, and such sums shall be available for administration, loans, relief, and rural rehabilitation for needy persons;

(4) To the Department of the Interior, Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, \$6,000,000, together with the balance of allocations heretofore made or hereafter to be made to such Administration under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937 which remain unobligated on June 30, 1938, and such amounts shall be available for administration, loans, and rural rehabilitation for needy persons and for Federal and non-Federal projects of the type specified for the Works Progress Administration under limitations (1), (2), and (3) of (1) (d) hereof;

(5) To the following agencies for administrative expenses incident to carrying out the purposes of this title: (a) General Accounting Office, \$4,180,000; (b) Treasury Department: Procurement Division, Branch of Supply, \$5,500,000; Division of Disbursement, \$3,500,000; Office of the Treasurer, \$750,000; Secret Service Division, \$300,000; Office of Commissioner of Accounts and Deposits and Division of Bookkeeping and Warrants, \$2,000,000; total, Treasury Department, \$12,050,000; (c) Department of Commerce, Bureau of Air Commerce, \$325,000; and (d) Department of Labor, United States Employment Service, \$1,500,000;

(6) To the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for expenditure in accordance with the provisions of section 16 of this title, \$3,500,000; and any allocations heretofore made or hereafter to be made to such Commission under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937 or prior Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts shall not be rescinded or reallocated for any other purpose;

(7) To the following agencies for administrative expenses: (a) National Emergency Council, \$250,000; (b) National Resources Committee, \$250,000; (c) Prison Industries Reorganization Administration, \$120,000; and

(8) To the Department of Justice, \$1,250,000, for administrative expenses in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935;

Total of appropriations, title I, \$1,529,425,000.

The funds made available by this title shall be used only for work relief or relief for persons in need except as otherwise specifically provided herein.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to correct a typographical error on page 2.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM: On page 2, line 20, strike out the third word and insert in lieu thereof the word "therein."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BACON: Page 1, line 4, strike out section 1 and insert the following as a substitute for title I:

"That to provide relief, and work relief, and to increase employment, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,250,000,000, which shall be available for the period commencing July 1, 1938, and ending on January 31, 1939.

"Sec. 2. (a) Not more than \$1,150,000,000 of the sum appropriated by section 1 shall be available for grants-in-aid to States to assist them in financing and administering such forms of relief and work relief and methods of increasing employment as may be determined upon and undertaken by them. Such amount shall be allocated by the Federal Relief Board (hereinafter established), with the approval of the President, among the several States upon the basis of the Board's findings and conclusions with respect to the facts concerning and weight to be given to unemployment and living costs in, and population and financial resources of, the several States. Not more than 15 percent of such amount shall be paid to any State.

"(b) The sum allocated to a State under subsection (a) shall be paid quarterly by order of the Federal Relief Board to the State if—

"(1) The Governor (or in the case of the District of Columbia, the District Commissioners) has certified to the Federal Relief Board that there has been established a board of relief trustees in such State, the membership of which is not composed solely of individuals who are members of the same political party, and that such board has the power and duty of receiving and disbursing sums which may be granted such State under this section;

"(2) The State board has certified to the Federal Relief Board that the State, or its subdivisions, or both, have provided or are prepared to provide an amount equal to not less than 25 percent of the amount allocated to it under this section, for relief, work relief, or methods of increasing employment; and

"(3) The State board has agreed to furnish to the Federal Relief Board such reports (respecting the administration of the relief, work relief, or methods of increasing employment with respect to which funds allocated to the State under this section are used) in such form and containing such information as the Federal Relief Board may from time to time require, and to comply with such provisions as the Federal Relief Board may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(c) If the Federal Relief Board finds that any part of an amount granted to a State under this section has been diverted to a purpose not reasonably within the purpose of furnishing relief, work relief, or increasing employment, or that more than 80 percent of the amount devoted to such purposes has been expended out of grants under this section, the amount of future grants to be made to the State shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount the Board determines has been diverted or the amount the Board determines to be such excess.

"(d) The Federal Relief Board shall allocate, out of the sum specified in subsection (a), such sums as it deems necessary on the basis of the needs of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone for relief, work relief, and increasing employment. Such sums shall be expended as the Board prescribes as necessary for such purposes and subject to such requirement, if any, as the Board may prescribe for contribution by the possessions to such purposes.

"Sec. 3. Not more than \$100,000,000 of the sum appropriated by section 1 shall be available to enable the Federal Relief Board, with the approval of the President, in its discretion and on its order, to make such grants or loans to States as it deems necessary in order to meet extraordinary and unforeseen emergencies and such grants or loans shall be made without regard to the provisions of section 2. The sum specified in this section shall also be available for all administrative expenses of the United States in carrying out the provisions of section 2 and this section.

"Sec. 4. (a) There is hereby established the Federal Relief Board, which shall be composed of three members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two of the members of the Board shall be members of the same political party and the President shall designate one of the members as chairman. Each member shall receive a salary at the rate of \$10,000 per annum.

"(b) The Board shall have the power and duty of carrying out sections 2 and 3 of this act, and such powers and duties shall be exercised under the direction and subject to the approval of the President.

"(c) The Board is authorized to make such expenditures, and, subject to the civil-service laws and rules and regulations made thereunder and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, as may be necessary to carry out its powers and duties.

"Sec. 5. Any person who knowingly makes any false statement in connection with securing a grant or loan or making any report or furnishing any information under section 2 or 3, or who solicits or receives political contributions from any person who directly or indirectly receives any part of a grant or loan made under section 2 or 3, or any person who, in administering any such grant or loan, discriminates against any person on account of race, religion, or political affiliation shall, on conviction thereof, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both. For the purposes of this section, each payment made by a State to which a grant or loan

has been made under section 2 or 3 for relief, work relief, or increasing employment shall be considered to consist one-fourth of funds of the State and three-fourths of funds of the United States.

"Sec. 6. The funds herein appropriated shall be so apportioned and distributed over the period beginning July 1, 1938, and ending on January 31, 1939, and shall be so administered during such period as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished during such period for relief purposes.

"Sec. 7. As used in this act, the term 'State' means the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 8. This act may be cited as the Relief Appropriation Act of 1938."

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment we offered to the relief bill last year. It does not in any way change the total figures allocated for relief as determined by the President; we accept his figures without quibble, but we direct attention to the administration of that amount. Under this proposal we allocate the total sum to the 48 States. This sum is to be handled by a bipartisan board set up for the simple purpose of allocating the money to the several States so that it may be distributed fairly and, as the bill says, having due regard to unemployment, living costs, population, and financial resources of the several States. This bipartisan board is set up for this sole purpose. Each State, before it can dispense the money given it by the Federal Government, must in turn set up a bipartisan State board to administer the money for relief purposes. Yesterday I described in quite detail the purposes of this bill.

We require that for every dollar given to the States by the Federal Government the States shall put up 25 cents. In other words, we require a State contribution, because we believe that in requiring State responsibility they must also make some contribution so the State responsibility will be a real one. The 25 cents to the dollar that we require is approximately what the States have to put up today. The testimony before our committee shows that the average sponsor's contribution to W. P. A. projects ranges from 17 percent to 30 percent; therefore, in requiring the State to put up 25 percent of the total amount for relief we are not putting any additional burden on the States than exists today because many of the States put up over 20 percent as their sponsor contribution.

Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to liquidate a huge Federal bureaucracy now existing in Washington and which, if not liquidated, some day will be on our necks and the necks of the country forever. In offering this motion last year the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. Woodrum] in opposing the amendment said:

Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly the principle set out in the Bacon amendment has much merit. Perhaps sometime we will reach a situation in this relief business when we will have to get down to the proposition of devising some permanent method of meeting relief. At the present time, however, we have not reached that point. I do not subscribe at the present moment to the statement of Mr. Hopkins that the Federal Government is now permanently in the relief business. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] opposed the amendment last year mainly on the ground we would soon be out of the relief business as far as the Federal Government is concerned and therefore we had better go along with the set-up as then existing. However, we are still in the relief business and we will be in the relief business for some time to come; therefore, the proposal that I make and that we on the Republican side of the House offer, is to set up a flexible system so that Federal contributions will go to the States and the States will administer the funds in accordance with local needs. We believe that the relief problem may differ in Arizona from New York. It cannot be the same in each State.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, this is not a partisan amendment. We are not trying to play politics. This proposal

is similar in substance to the old scheme that existed under the C. W. A. 3 or 4 years ago. We believe in State responsibility. We believe that the Federal Government should not build up a huge permanent bureaucracy to administer relief, and we believe that we can administer public relief more efficiently through State control and administration. Furthermore, we believe that under our proposal where the States are required to put up 25 cents for every dollar the Federal Government puts up, that more of the relief money will reach those in actual need. It will take care of a situation that is today being taken care of inadequately.

There are over two million persons on direct relief in the several States who are receiving only \$22 a month on the average. We believe that turning the matter over to the States will give employables on direct relief a fairer and better break, because the State responsibility will be more willing to take care of their needs.

Mr. Chairman, we also believe that under this proposal we will go a long way toward eliminating the charge that there are politics in relief and relief in politics. These charges are being made daily in the press. They cannot be ignored. The results of a Gallup poll indicated clearly that whether or not these charges may be true, at least the people of America think they are true. This is a demoralizing situation. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the speech I made a year ago is just about as good today as it was then. I do believe there is a great deal of merit in the proposal. I have been hoping that we would never get to the proposition of recognizing relief as a permanent institution, but if we ever do get to it, I think the States should have a larger part in the control of the matter. But whatever may be said about that, we have now a real condition to meet. In the first place, the States are not able to take the load at the present time. In the second place, to undertake to interfere with it and change the machinery now would cause suffering and misery that it would be just the reverse of what we are trying to do, which is to relieve the unemployed and furnish employment to those millions of people who are out of work and increase the purchasing power of America in order that all business and industry may go forward again on the road of recovery.

Mr. KELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. Is there any State asking for such a change in the law?

Mr. WOODRUM. There is no State I know of; and the State of the distinguished gentleman from New York could not carry the burden if it had it at the present time. As I say, no matter how much merit there may be to some such proposal, certainly you cannot do it in this sort of fashion during the present emergency period.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BACON) there were—ayes 39, noes 106.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 3, line 13, after "administration", strike out "\$75,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to cut the N. Y. A. from \$75,000,000 to \$20,000,000. If there is any possible excuse for that operation it relates to whatever they do to help the boys and girls who go to school and college. I have a description of some of the activities of the so-called adult-education projects for which about \$60,000,000 of the \$75,000,000 is spent. This is a paper by the head of one of

the schools they conduct, the one at Auburn, N. Y., where I live. The name of the paper is, The Variation of the Affective Quality of Vestibular Stimulation with Chronological Age. The paper is a report on an experiment conducted last year at the Auburn collegiate center with 213 children of the Auburn public schools, using a turning table. The result of the experiment showed there was no year at which children ceased to enjoy activities which produced vestibular excitement, such as turning on piano stools and riding on the merry-go-round and the roller coaster, but that the age was spread out over the whole range of adolescence.

If you want to vote \$60,000,000 for that kind of an operation, vote against my amendment. If you want to vote to cut out the waste and cut this activity down to where it is confined to something that can have a possible and plausible excuse for being, vote for my amendment. I hope the House will show some semblance of sense and responsibility in connection with this amendment. I have appreciated that most of the Members on the majority side of the aisle have enjoyed being rubber stamps and voting for things which have no justification and are absolutely foolish. This is the test. Are you sincere in trying to do the right thing with the people's money, or are you going to go hog-wild and spend it just because there is an opportunity to spend?

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the study which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] holds up to ridicule, implying that it is typical of the work of the N. Y. A., may be a sample but not a specimen of the educational scope and work of N. Y. A. I am not ready to say whether this effort cited by the gentleman offering the amendment is valuable or worthless, although as a schoolman I am very much less inclined to consider valueless certain educational efforts which may be thus regarded by so-called hard-headed, practical businessmen. If I wanted to be critical or cynical, I could cite studies made by graduate students in our outstanding and reputable universities, and even in industrial laboratories, which might be held up to scorn with equal justice. I do not wish to attempt to defend each and all studies or educational projects sponsored by all schools or colleges. Let us not make a mountain out of a molehill. Let us look at general effects.

Mr. Chairman, a year ago when the relief bill was being passed I favored the earmarking of \$75,000,000 for the use of the N. Y. A. I am glad it was done at that time. My remarks on that occasion apply equally today. I believe the gentleman from New York has taken the most ridiculous and extreme case he could find. We have heard the general criticism leveled against the W. P. A. In every instance the carping critics refer to the program as a matter of leaf raking. We have heard many people say, "Yes, they go out on the highways and they lean on the shovel handles," absolutely ignoring the millions of dollars worth of fine work of a permanent character that has been done adding to the total wealth of the country.

When the gentleman from New York refers to some apparently, and to him, nonsensical study, he is absolutely ignoring the significant work that has been done for the young people of this country in high schools and colleges through the National Youth Administration. I have been dean of a teachers' college. I know that 3 years ago out of an enrollment of about a thousand, 325 students at one time were paying their way entirely through college or partly through college, by means of this Government aid.

I know what this has meant to hundreds of worthy young people. I have had five such students who have paid their way through college here in my office at Washington, and more efficient young people cannot be found in the State of Arizona than those who have thus paid their way through college by means of this Government aid, permitting them to do student work.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND: On page 2, line 25, after the words "flood control" and the semicolon, insert the following: "beach erosion;"

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I understand it is construed that conservation would cover beach erosion, but there may be some question because of the technical interpretation that is given the word "conservation" and the fact that beach erosion is treated as a separate project like flood control. I hope the gentleman will accept the amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I may say to my colleague that he called my attention to this and we have taken the matter up with the Works Progress Administration. They say that unquestionably the activity he has in mind is covered by the word "conservation." I do not believe there is the slightest doubt about it. I would hate to have the amendment go in here to that effect, because I am confident that question is covered.

Mr. BLAND. I have heard that in some of the previous legislation the words "beach erosion" are used. There is a Beach Erosion Board. Provision is made here for flood control. While these gentlemen give that interpretation, I would not like an interpretation to be given after the bill has passed which would eliminate beach erosion. The matter can be corrected now by writing in the bill the interpretation we intend to have.

Mr. WOODRUM. I can give the gentleman the assurance the interpretation is that the project is included under the word "conservation."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANZETTA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANZETTA: Page 5, after line 24, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that in the administration of this Relief Appropriation Act there shall be provided work opportunities through the Federal Works Progress Administration for all unemployed workers who cannot find employment in private industry. The Works Progress Administration shall so administer the funds allotted to it and so regulate the employment of unemployed persons that no Works Progress Administration worker who cannot find employment in private industry at wages not less than the prevailing rate of wages for work for which he or she is reasonably fitted by training or experience shall be discharged from the Works Progress Administration rolls and that any Works Progress Administration employee securing temporary private employment shall be furloughed during the period of private employment by the Works Progress Administration and not discharged from the rolls: *Provided*, That nothing in this resolution shall be construed to force the Works Progress Administration to continue the employment of any person who is properly dischargeable for cause."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. TABER. Is the gentleman from Virginia going to make the point of order?

Mr. WOODRUM. After the gentleman makes his statement. I have reserved it.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I also reserve a point of order.

Mr. LANZETTA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is similar to House Joint Resolution 440, popularly known as the Schwellenbach-Allen resolution.

The amendment has a twofold purpose. First, it prohibits the discharge of W. P. A. workers who cannot find

employment in private industry, and, second, it permits the furloughing of W. P. A. workers during the period of their employment in private industry and allows for their reemployment by the W. P. A. immediately upon termination of their private employment.

The members of this committee will agree that there is no logic or reason in discharging W. P. A. workers at a time when our industries are laying off men. We saw the disastrous results of this policy last year when under our 1938 Relief Appropriation Act, W. P. A. workers were laid off by the wholesale at a time when industry had slowed down and when men were being discharged.

I believe that in trying to solve the unemployment problem we should apply the same practical and logical methods which we use in our everyday life. To discharge W. P. A. workers when there is no opportunity for private employment is the height of folly and such action only tends to aggravate our economic problems by further reducing the purchasing power of the country. What we should do in times of stress is to try and keep as many persons at work as it is humanly possible and that is what the first part of my amendment proposes to do. I believe that every W. P. A. worker should be continued until he or she is able to obtain private employment. I am certain that when such an opportunity, with higher pay and greater advantages, does come, that no relief worker will fail to take advantage of it.

Another point which I wish to make is that if we discharge W. P. A. workers at a time when there is no chance for employment in private industry, we will be playing right into the hands of a few chiseling employers who are always ready to take advantage of any surplus existing in the labor market and who are always ready to purchase labor at the lowest price.

As to the second provision of my amendment, I am of the firm opinion that it will encourage W. P. A. workers to seek private employment once their minds are eased as to the future. To know that they will be restored to their old W. P. A. jobs should they lose their outside jobs will be a sufficient incentive for them to seek private employment with its greater opportunities for advancement.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANZETTA. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS. The gentleman realizes, of course, that at present—and I hope this bill is going to correct this—if a man does go out and take a private job and then loses it, in many States he has to go back to the charity organization and get certified as a pauper before he can get back on W. P. A.

Mr. LANZETTA. The gentleman is correct. I have had a number of cases where W. P. A. workers who sought employment in private industry have had great difficulty after losing their jobs, in getting back on the W. P. A. rolls, and some never did get back.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANZETTA. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not a fact that the actual cost of keeping the record on these men is almost as much to the Government as the cost would be if we would give them the job when they came back?

Mr. LANZETTA. I believe that is correct.

The adoption of this amendment is not going to increase the cost, but it will ease the minds of the workers, and I believe it may bring about the much sought for results. As a matter of fact, I think that in the long run it may help solve the unemployment problem, because when industry does pick up W. P. A. workers will not be afraid to leave their W. P. A. jobs for outside employment. But unless you adopt this amendment you cannot expect a person with dependents to take any chances.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANZETTA. I yield.

Mr. MAY. As a matter of fact, when they go out into private industry and as a result of going out are not employed again in W. P. A., is not this a deterrent on their going to private industry?

Mr. LANZETTA. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANZETTA. I yield.

Mr. BEITER. In other words, if a man who is now employed on a W. P. A. project is offered a job in private industry, he refuses that offer because he is fearful he will not be able to get back on the W. P. A. rolls and he is also fearful that it will prove to be only a temporary job.

Mr. LANZETTA. Yes.

Mr. BEITER. And that more or less freezes a great many of these people on the W. P. A.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order for two reasons. The amendment is not germane at the point where it is offered in the bill; and, in the second place, section 2 of the bill, which is at the present moment in the bill, provides that the funds herein appropriated shall be apportioned over a given period of time based on an estimate of an average of 2,800,000 workers to be given positions, a program which has been approved by the American Federation of Labor and the Committee on Industrial Organization as being an adequate program. The proposed amendment is absolutely nugatory of section 2 on page 6. In the first place, it requires the Works Progress Administration immediately to give jobs to all unemployed workers and freezes them on the rolls so they cannot go off. For this reason the amendment is certainly not germane.

Mr. LANZETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York on the point of order.

Mr. LANZETTA. I think the point made by the gentleman from Virginia that this is not the proper place for this amendment is not correct, inasmuch as the last sentence of section 1 reads as follows:

The funds made available by this title shall be used only for work relief or relief for persons in need, except as otherwise specifically provided herein.

I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this section has to do with relief workers and that my amendment also has to do with relief workers. I think the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has taken too broad a view on this amendment. If he will read the second part of the amendment, he will find that it reads as follows:

The Works Progress Administration shall so administer the funds allotted to it, and so regulate the employment of unemployed persons that no Works Progress Administration worker who cannot find employment in private industry at wages not less than the prevailing rate of wages for work for which he or she is reasonably fitted by training or experience shall be discharged from the Works Progress Administration rolls.

In other words, it does not add to the W. P. A. rolls, but it only allows for the retention of those who are already on.

I therefore cannot agree with the objection made by the gentleman from Virginia that it will increase the number of persons on the rolls, and that inasmuch as the appropriation under this bill is for a fixed number of workers, that the amendment is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the point of order made by the gentleman from Virginia that the amendment is not germane to the portion of the bill where it is offered is good, and the Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOILEAU: Page 3, line 2, after the word "to", strike out the word "needy."

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I discussed this amendment at some length on Tuesday. The purpose of the language on the top of page 3 is to permit the continuation of projects such as lime and marl projects that have been carried on so successfully in rural areas of the country. The W. P. A. labor is used for the purpose of preparing the material, grinding the lime, and so forth, but the local farmers provide equipment and trucks for hauling the lime. These have proven

to be very successful projects in all of these rural communities where these projects have been carried on. I have taken the matter up with the distinguished gentleman from Virginia and I believe that he is willing to accept the amendment. If so, I do not desire to take up any more time.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, gentlemen will recall that we discussed the matter yesterday. The question arose as to whether the projects utilized the services of relief workers according to W. P. A. standards. I have inquired and I find since that time that they do; that is, that 95 percent of the people who work on these projects are on relief. Therefore, I think there is a good deal of logic in what the gentleman says and so far as I am personally concerned I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 3, after the word "Agriculture", strike out "\$175,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$155,000,000."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am sure there is no Member of the House who does not recognize the obligation to provide for those in need at this difficult time. Those who are suffering must be cared for and, of course, the Federal Government must assume its fair share of the burden.

Insofar as relief is concerned the question at issue is not as to the amount but as to the method of administration. The proposal embodied in the minority report, if adopted, will not only provide every cent recommended for relief by Mr. Hopkins, but 25 percent over and above that amount, as well as a large saving in administrative expenditure by the elimination of waste, extravagance, and political operation.

The amendment which I offer is directed primarily not at relief to be furnished by the Farm Security Administration, but at the very large administrative expenditure of that organization. The Farm Security Administration has an overhead at the present time amounting to about 14 percent. It amounts to some \$25,000,000.

The hearings indicate that this Administration maintains a personnel today of almost 11,000 people, with over 10,000 of them in the field, including some 3,000 county supervisors. It maintains no less than 1,700 county offices, 42 State offices, and 12 regional offices. It operates through county supervisors and county committees apparently distinct from and in addition to similar county supervisors and county committees operating under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

The functions of this Administration as outlined to your committee are surely more paternalistic than those of any other agency that has come before your committee. They include periodic visits to individual homes of farmers with a view to instructing them in such matters as how to put up their canned goods, how to plant their farms, how to talk to their creditors, and other similar matters. The overhead is the direct result of this paternalism.

My amendment, if adopted, will permit an increase for relief as compared with what this Administration has had for the current year, of about \$15,000,000, with a reduction of \$10,000,000 in administrative expenditure. I offer the amendment with a view to curbing administrative expenditure, and to saving the sum of \$20,000,000 in the totals carried by the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CREAL: Page 4, at the end of line 9, strike out the semicolon, insert a comma and the following words: "and out of this amount so appropriated the Secretary of Agriculture shall use \$4,000,000, if that much is necessary, to reimburse the tobacco growers for taxes illegally collected under the operation

of the Kerr-Smith Tobacco Act. The Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe such rules as are necessary to make such payments to the proper parties in interest."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, day before yesterday I made some remarks on this same matter. This may be the last big general appropriation bill ever made by this Government. If it solves the purposes intended to be solved by the friends of the appropriation, no more will be needed; if it has all the bad effects the enemies of this appropriation say it will have, those in authority will not have the opportunity of presenting other bills. For this reason I say it is highly possible that this may be the last big appropriation bill for everything combined before us in many a day.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on the theory that an individual or the Federal Government should be just before generous. There are two classes of processing taxes: There are the millers, some of whom absorbed all the tax, some who absorbed part of it only, and some who absorbed none of it; so every case has to stand on its own bottom and has to be heard. It is true there is legislation providing that if a man paid a processing tax and can definitely show that he did not pass it on, he has a chance to recover in the courts; but this goes into a distinct and separate class altogether. There is absolutely no question about passing this tobacco growers' tax on. Where a man drove up with \$200 worth of tobacco you took \$50 out of his check and gave him a check for \$150. That is not open to litigation, and he ought not to be required to go into the courts and pay some attorney a percentage for collection, and the Federal Government have to pay more than the face of the claim—claim plus court costs.

This does not add to the size of the bill, I may say to those who want to keep the appropriation as low as possible; it comes out of the \$175,000,000 set aside for the Department of Agriculture.

Here is what will happen if the point of order is insisted upon and if it is sustained: You are going to pay these figures in full when this Congress adjourns. They are standing by waiting to step into the courts immediately upon adjournment of Congress and file these suits. They will be filed by attorneys in the Federal courts. I get letters from these people all the time asking why we do not do something about it. In the meantime the Government attorney in court says: "I move to continue. Congress has before it legislation to pay this money back."

Why let these cases go to court and incur the additional cost? If we do not do something along the line suggested by this amendment these suits will be filed, the Federal Government will pay more than the face of the claim and the claimant will get less than the face of the claim, and this multiplicity of litigation will go on. Why not stop it? Why does not the House do it? If we do not what will happen? This bill passed the Senate by a unanimous vote. If the House does not take action it will be put in the bill again when it goes to the Senate. Then who will be chairman of the conferees to rule upon the question of germaneness? Nobody. You will bring it back here and it will be adopted. That is what happened in the case of rural electrification. We asked for a slight increase but the committee did not grant it. The Senate put it in and then you took it.

I called attention a few days ago to the fact that a slight increase was needed in the Federal tobacco grading appropriation. I could not get the ear of either the committee or the Department of Agriculture; but the item was put on the bill in the Senate, and when it comes back to the House you will take it. Why does not the House do some of these things? It ought to. Even if this bill passes the House without this item in it, it will come back to the House carrying the item, so why does not the House put it in in the first place?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, on the point of order I may say that the amendment is not germane. Further than that the committee has under consideration a bill to

take care of the matter the gentleman proposes. It has no place in this bill. I insist on the point of order.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, the provisions of that bill referred to do not reach this particular type of case. Fifteen million dollars are made available, it is true, but here is what will happen to the \$15,000,000. The big processors will swallow that up before you say "scat," and these fellows standing around with claims of \$150 will not get a cent. That \$15,000,000 is not a drop in the bucket. I am talking about these fellows with the \$30 claims and the \$150 claims. Many of them are tenants. A great number of them are relief workers. First, let us pay them what we owe them before we attempt to give them a donation.

Mr. Chairman, as to germaneness, it seems to me that section 3 is very broad indeed. It states—

available for the administration of loans, relief, rural rehabilitation for needy persons.

They need what we owe them. They need what the laws of the land state is justly theirs because we took that which did not belong to us. There seems to be a very wide discretion in there. I was very much in hope the point of order would not be insisted upon, but I want to assure you this will be in the Senate bill, you will take it and like it. I want a specific amount set aside to pay tobacco growers a rebate of this tax.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] offers an amendment which seeks to pay money to tobacco growers for taxes alleged to have been illegally assessed. Certainly such amendment has no place in this bill nor does it come within the purposes of the pending bill; therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: Page 4, line 9, after the word "persons", insert a semicolon and the following: "and of the sums made available by this paragraph \$2,000,000 may be used for payments to farmers for cover crops, listing, and special practices in extreme drought areas."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the point of order be ruled on.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order for the reason the Chair just ruled on a similar proposition. This undertakes to use relief funds to make certain payments.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to this difference: In the pending bill this fund is made available for loans, for relief, and for rural rehabilitation for needy persons. The Chair will notice that there is a comma after the word "relief" and there is no comma after "rehabilitation," so that as I construe the language loans may be made without the limitation and relief may be made without the limitation, but rural rehabilitation may be available only to needy persons. It seems to me that is very clear. If there were no commas in there, or if there was a comma after the word "rehabilitation" and before the words "for needy persons," then it would refer to the entire paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention again to the proposition that this is limited, aside from the point I am making on this particular language. This amendment limits the application of this fund which is sought to be made available by the amendment to the extreme drought areas, which would classify it in relief form, it seems to me. If you make it applicable only to the extreme drought areas, certainly it would be a form of relief, and has been so treated and considered in previous cases.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

Paragraph 3, page 4, provides that the sums shall be available for administration, loans, relief, and rural rehabilitation for needy persons. That certainly is limited to those on relief.

The gentleman from Texas offers an amendment which would seek to enlarge that class by including a class of farmers whether they may be on relief or not.

The Chair therefore thinks the point of order made by the gentleman from Virginia is well taken, and sustains the point of order.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: Page 4, line 9, after the word "persons", insert a semicolon and the following: "and of the sums made available by this paragraph \$2,000,000 may be used for payments to needy farmers for cover crops, listing, and special practices in extreme drought areas."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, there are a few counties in the five Southwestern States and some scattered counties in other areas where the ravages of dust storms have been very severe and in which great damage is occasioned, not only in those counties but in surrounding counties, with a tendency to spread because of the inability to treat this particular land in the way it should be treated, and the condition in most of these counties has been serious in drought years.

I call attention particularly to the fact that notwithstanding the vast expenditures as provided by this bill, and they are vast expenditures, there is not a single project that could be fashioned which would reach this particularly distressing problem. No project that could be fashioned or formed under this bill could accomplish that purpose. You might put a project in there and you might relieve the folks, but there is special need for treatment of that soil, and the money that goes in there under the ordinary form of Government activities is not sufficient to protect and save that land.

Mr. Chairman, this does not increase the appropriation in any way. It simply makes part of this \$175,000,000 fund, which is going to be used for loans and for relief, available for a more effective purpose of saving the land. It would take only \$2,000,000 of the \$175,000,000 to treat a very serious problem, the effects of which are felt practically all over the Nation. I believe it would be wise if the Congress should vote to allow this land to be treated with cover crops, listing, and special practices to protect not only those counties, but the surrounding counties.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am very much in sympathy with the amendment of the gentleman, but I am wondering if \$2,000,000 will be sufficient to do what he has in mind.

Mr. JONES. We are hoping funds may be available from other sources. Of course, I should like to have more money, but I think a great deal of good would be done with \$2,000,000. I wanted to put this proposal on a basis where no one could seriously object to it. This would do a wonderful work. I may state to the gentleman that 2 years ago \$2,000,000 was made available, and, by buying the oil and gas for just this kind of work, more valuable work was done, as is recognized by all who are familiar with those sections, than anything that has ever been done with any similar amount of money by the Government in those areas. Every one of those who represent counties in this situation will confirm what I am saying about it.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, of course all of us usually follow the distinguished gentleman from Texas on matters of this kind, but may I say I do not believe this relief bill is the place to be starting another farm relief

program, and that is what this is. The Farm Security Administration is now using money on a program they have laid out which goes into every farm district and to every class of farmers. The money has been allocated and included in their budget requirements, yet here it is sought to set up a new farm program.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. There are a number of farm laborers who really need help and would be benefited by this amendment, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUM. There is no more active, diligent, or efficient committee in the House than the Committee on Agriculture. Its members hold meetings, they understand the farm problem, they have hearings and they go into the problem, and they do not hesitate to come to us when they can bring us anything that will help the farmer. But who knows what is meant by payments to farmers for cover crops, listing, and special practices? This is a new farm program set up in the middle of this relief program. The Farm Security Administration has its program laid out. There is nothing of that kind in it. I submit to you from the agricultural districts that if this is a worthy project why was it not included in the agricultural relief bill we have just passed, and not only passed, but we have amended it almost every day. There is the place to put this new program, not bring it here and inject it into the middle of this bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I am sorry, I have only a little time.

This applies not only to the amendment of our good friend, the gentleman from Texas, but I may say the Committee on Appropriations has worked as hard as it knows how. It has heard Members of Congress and others interested. I do hope this Committee will let this program go through substantially as it has been brought in here without enlarging it or going out into new fields of activity. I hope very much the amendment of the gentleman from Texas will not be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma) there were—ayes 29, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLER: On page 2, line 1, after the "(1)", insert "To employ not less than 3,500,000 persons." On page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out "\$1,250,000,000" and insert "\$1,500,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. The provisions of the amendment are not germane to this paragraph of the bill. They seek to set up the number of persons who are to be employed. There is no attempt anywhere in the bill to specify the number of persons who are to be employed. The amendment is not germane either to the bill or to this paragraph in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The whole purpose of the paragraph on page 2 is to provide relief. This amendment seeks to fix the number of persons to be employed and also to increase the appropriation.

The Chair thinks the amendment is germane and in order and, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, before I make any other remark, I wish to say the present bill is far and away the most liberal bill, both in its provisions and its attitude, of any of the bills that have been brought forward on the subject of relief. This bill has corrected many of the faults of previous bills. I noticed awhile ago that the statement is still being made on the floor of the House that when a man on work relief loses his job he is out and cannot get back on work relief again. This is no longer the rule, and this bill specifically corrects that abuse.

As has been stated by the chairman of the subcommittee, the idea of this bill is to provide for 2,800,000 persons. In my judgment, that is inadequate. This amendment represents not only my own idea but it was suggested by the progressive group as the only amendment we care to put forward on this bill.

We want to bring to your attention the fact that an additional 700,000 men and an additional quarter of a billion dollars of money would largely solve the conditions that are arising so rapidly at the present time.

I have no doubt that it is in the mind of most men in this body that we are coming sooner or later to a full acceptance of the idea put forward by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LANZETTA] that we will be compelled ultimately to see to it that there is provided an opportunity for a job for every man or woman who wants to work. We are coming to that very policy and we ought to see clearly that this is true. We are not going to be very long in getting to it, in adopting and accepting it nationally.

But at the present time we are doing the best we can to provide a sufficient amount of money to employ 3,500,000 workers through W. P. A. during the coming 7 months.

I want to repeat that this measure is the most liberal that has ever been proposed here. We ought also to see that all these arguments against the amount of money to be expended are not well founded; that is to say, they are saying you have got to balance the Budget, that the Nation is just about to go broke, that our children will be pauperized paying these terrible debts, and a lot of other foolish scare stuff. The truth of the matter is our total national indebtedness at the present time is only about $8\frac{1}{2}$ percent of our national wealth. At the end of the Civil War our total national indebtedness constituted 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ percent of our total national wealth. We paid that without difficulty. If we reduce our present debt condition to plain common sense we will see we are not in any danger.

Let us apply it to a given individual. If a man owns a \$10,000 farm and owes $8\frac{1}{2}$ percent of its value, his debt would be \$833 on it, he would owe exactly the same proportion we owe nationally at the present time. No farmer that I know of, and I am one of them, would be scared with \$833 of indebtedness against a \$10,000 farm. It just is not sensible to look at that side of it at all. We have got to look at this whole problem as a thing we must do, and go ahead and do it.

The mistake came in not providing a much larger sum last summer when we needed it, when the conspiracy had arisen to break down the New Deal. What the administration ought to have done at that time was to announce that \$3,000,000,000 was available for expenditure and that we would spend as much as necessary to keep up the increasing employment and resulting national income. I wired the President I thought that ought to be done. If that had been done last August it would have stopped the recession we have been experiencing during the past few months, would have picked up employment, improved ability to spend, and kept up the 3-year long improvement in the industry of the country, and given us \$75,000,000,000 national income this year instead of fifty-five billions.

From the very beginning of this administration we have listened all too much to the advice of those interests which are fundamentally opposed to the New Deal. Instead of spending to the full extent of providing a job for every man and woman who wants to work, as we ought to have done, we have scrimped and pinched and talked about balancing the Budget. We provided jobs for no more than one-third of our unwillingly idle at any time. That has been our mistake from the beginning. If we had put everybody to work doing permanently useful work during the past 2 years, when planning ahead permitted it, our national income would have reached \$100,000,000,000 for this year 1938. Out of \$100,000,000,000 income we can take sufficient money through legitimate taxation to equal our expenses and begin to pay the debts we have been piling up. And we are not going to do this Budget balancing stunt

until we do approach that annual national income. That is our task. To talk relief and overlook this necessity is to continue to be penny-wise and dollar foolish.

This bill now under consideration is a fine relief bill, but a poor recovery measure. I hope we may open our eyes to this fact. We should have been done with relief 2 years ago, and been forcing the recovery of the age of plenty. That I repeat is our problem. We ought no longer to give heed to the advice of those interests—who sing lullabies to us while seeking to scuttle the ship of state.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, what the country needs desperately is an immediate increase in employment and active buying power. This bill, as the gentleman from Illinois has said, is by far the best bill of this sort that has ever been brought in here, the best balanced, containing the most improvement of a permanent and solid nature, but we know, if we know anything, that the work in housing, the work on P. W. A., and a number of other items in this bill will take time to get started. The W. P. A. is the only agency, practically, in the whole bill which can immediately put people to work. Therefore it is our conviction that this amendment should be adopted in order to enable W. P. A. to take the load right now, to take it vigorously, and take it sufficiently to do some real good immediately. Then next winter, in view of the fact that this appropriation for W. P. A. is only supposed to last for 7 months, if these other parts of the program have then taken up the slack and caused increased employment in other fields, it will evidently be possible to consider how much is required for W. P. A. for the balance of the year. The amount of the appropriation contained in the bill for W. P. A., however, will not be enough for any considerable increase in W. P. A. employment. Only 2,800,000 can be employed with \$1,250,000,000—not even one out of four of our unemployed.

As the gentleman from Illinois has pointed out, this is a measure which merely offers a minimum of justice to a fraction of the unemployed among the American people. It is an evidence of democratic government doing a necessary thing, not solving the problem, but partially meeting a need that must be met. I am convinced that in order to have a balance in this program, the essential thing is to enable W. P. A. to expand quickly and sufficiently, and then it can coordinate its employment with the other parts of the recovery as they get under way in earnest. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOODRUM) there were—ayes 23, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'NEILL of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the passage of the bill under consideration will mean jobs, and jobs are needed. The "save America" boys have been getting a lot off their chests during this debate, but I doubt very much that there will be very many of them who will vote against the bill for they honestly know that there is no other thing that can be immediately done to relieve a threatening situation. One argument has been particularly amusing—the suggestion that the Government is in business and that recovery will come if we repeal the social advances made through legislation enacted by this Democratic Congress. It is amusing when we recall that less than a year ago the President of the United States sent his Secretary of the Treasury to New York to make the famous "balance the Budget" speech and its only echo from business was "we are afraid." We can recall the fact that the President in order to take "Government out

of business" suspended the operation of the Public Works Administration and returned to the Treasury some \$300,000,000. Still business did not take up the slack. As a further concession to the "do not spenders" the Works Progress Administration rolls were reduced in every State and the amount of compensation reduced. Some who were receiving as little as \$70 a month on which to keep themselves and their families in health were reduced to \$60. And still business was unable to bring about any improvement. I was among those in my party who, in an effort to cooperate with those who were complaining about large spending and oppressive taxation, helped defeat certain administration tax recommendations during the consideration of the revenue bill. We all know that the undistributed-profits tax is practically out of the act entirely. Luxury and nuisance taxes have been almost entirely repealed. What further concessions can be made? Since the beginning of all this retrenchment the rolls of the unemployed have been steadily increasing. Where are people going to turn for help. This is their Government, all the people of the Nation are the Government, and we might consider that only the accident of opportunity makes it possible for some to have more than they need while others have uncertain shelter, insufficient food and clothing.

I received the following letter today. Of course, I will not read into the RECORD the name of the sender, but you may see it if you wish. It is addressed on the stationery of an Atlantic City Hotel, and reads as follows:

To the Honorable EDWARD L. O'NEILL.

MY DEAR MR. O'NEILL: As a voter in your district I beg and implore you to vote against and to do all in your power to prevent the passage of the spending bill. Prevent inflation. Vote American. Be American. Save America.

Very truly yours,

You have all heard of Atlantic City—America's playground. The writer of the letter has little to worry about, being able to afford its luxuries and conveniences. Maybe if another administration had prevented the gambling inflation of the 1920's we would not have our present-day problem. Save America? Save it in the only way possible—take care of its people. America is threatened. There is no use denying that. Alien isms are permeating. Our less fortunate are nibbling and biting on these philosophies. Hungry people will not care about the Constitution. They will not care either about a three-branch form of government—a government of checks and balances. Only one thing means anything to a hungry man—a way in which to satisfy his hunger.

Those who advocate subversive principles will never be able to sell them to the American people. America is safe in that respect. But if those whose education and opportunity have enabled them to ascend somewhat on the economic ladder, those who should the more appreciate the free government under which they live, do not see the light in time and know that their fellow citizens in need are their obligation, the things they value most are in danger, not from opposition—from Communists and Fascists—but from America itself. Unyielding greed will bring it about. There will be hunger marches. More "bonus" armies.

It is a difficult job, but a clear-cut one, to take the greed out of those who "have" and the envy out of those who "have not." Cooperation with an administration the sole purpose of which is to improve the economic and social well-being of all of its people will bring it about.

The bill under consideration will enable the W. P. A. to pay a living wage. It will make room for hundreds of thousands of others unable to find work anywhere. It will make possible the carrying out of essential public projects by the municipalities of the Nation—hospitals, road building, bridge construction, new public buildings. It will extend the accomplishments of the National Youth Administration—a more educated America. It will mean a program of work. We tried it once and it did not fail. We simply began to stop too soon.

I hope that before we adjourn tonight an overwhelming majority of the House will have placed its approval upon it. [Applause.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HULL: Page 4, line 8, after the word "loans" insert "including loans to farmers to prevent farm mortgage foreclosures."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve his point of order.

Mr. WOODRUM. I reserve it briefly.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this in order that the rehabilitation program may be so extended as to take care of those farmers who are losing their farms on farm-mortgage foreclosures. As it is at present, and as the law is at present, the Farm Security Administration can wait until a farmer has been sold out under foreclosure proceedings and is completely down and out, and then it can make him a loan up to three or four thousand dollars in order to reestablish him on some other farm. With the amount which will become available under this bill, it should be easily possible for the Farm Security Administration to aid many farmers before they are sold out under foreclosure proceedings, keeping them on the farm and giving them a chance on the old place to go ahead and make some progress. In the 11 counties which I happen to represent, and I think they are typical of the farming districts of the Northwest, the Federal land bank now owns 439 farms that have been acquired under foreclosure proceedings. In addition to that they are bringing about 500 or more foreclosures at this time, so that within a 12- or 14-month period, the Land Bank of St. Paul, Minn., is going to own pretty close to 800 farms in our district. In one county in my district they already own over 100 dairy farms. In another county they own 89 dairy farms, and they are proceeding with their foreclosures now at a greater rate than has been done since the depression started.

Furthermore, the price of farm products has gone into a continued decline and the income of the farmers of the dairy sections is going to be very much less this year than it was in 1937, when 305 farms were foreclosed and sold. The number of farm foreclosures is going to be rapidly increased in the next 12 to 15 months. All I ask is that the Farm Security Administration may provide the same assistance and make the same provisions for the farmer on his farm who is about to be sold out as it provides for that same farmer immediately after he is sold out. In other words, I think they should keep the man on the farm, and not make him lose his all through foreclosure procedure. I hope the gentleman from Virginia will withdraw his point of order. It seems to me that the Farm Security Administration can properly handle the matter.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order that it is not germane. It seeks to set up a different procedure on farm mortgages for particular purposes. It does not qualify under the section for needy persons.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order. The bill now provides for loans, under the Farm Security Act, for the rehabilitation of farmers. All that my amendment does is to extend that same assistance to the farmer before he loses his farm instead of providing for it after he loses his farm. It does seem to me that it is not such a broadening of powers as to make it subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. It is true that the bill does provide for rural rehabilitation for needy persons, but it does not provide anywhere in the bill for the subject of farm mortgages, and by that inclusion it certainly widens the basic scope of the bill. The Chair is of opinion that the amendment is not germane, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON: Page 5, line 15, after the semicolon, strike out "(a) National Emergency Council, \$250,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, the National Resources Committee was created by Executive order. It is not a creature of the Congress. They have functioned to review reports and surveys made by the Reclamation Service, the Army engineers, and the Department of Commerce. All you gentlemen are familiar with this green-covered book which represents their work on water resources last year, Drainage Basin Problems and Programs. There is not one valuable thing in that book. They got all of their information from existing agencies, some of it 3 and 4 years old and obsolete, and printed it in this book. Gentlemen, you are familiar with the large book on technocracy; that is, you are familiar with the cover of the book, but have never looked on the inside of it. In addition to the book on technocracy, this National Resources Committee published *Our Cities in the National Economy*, and *Alaska, Its Resources and Developments*.

All this information they gather up and rehash and put into books and forward them over to Members of Congress. We are going to spend under this bill \$250,000 to continue this absolutely unnecessary and unjustified Board.

The Budget reports that last year the two biggest items of expense of this National Resources Committee were \$97,000 for travel and \$88,000 for printing. Again I repeat that the material contained in the books with which we are deluged but which we do not read is just a rehash of materials they gathered from other existing governmental agencies. I cannot think that this House will be guilty of providing \$250,000 in a relief bill to continue the National Resources Board.

I happen to serve on the Rivers and Harbors, the Flood Control, and the Irrigation and Reclamation Committees. There is a certain procedure for projects. They are first surveyed by the Reclamation Service or the Board of Army Engineers. Report is made to Congress. The project is examined by a committee and if approved is recommended to Congress and the money is appropriated. There is absolutely no excuse for the expense of this National Resources Board. If we need a planning committee the Committee on Rivers and Harbors have reported out a bill providing for a planning commission that this Congress can create.

I hope the committee will strike out this \$250,000, because that is too high a price to pay for this kind of publications. I challenge any on this floor to say that they feel the publications issued by this committee have been of any value to the Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, it is true that the National Resources Committee was created by Executive order. If the gentleman will examine the hearings on the subject before the committee, he or any other Member sufficiently interested will see that we went into this matter very carefully. The amount provided for administrative expenses greatly restricts and reduces the program of the National Resources Committee.

This committee has done very valuable work, as shown in their reports, their studies, and their publications—really pioneer work on the question of the natural resources of the United States. They have collected data and information which is very valuable to the Congress and its committees.

I may state that we reduced them from \$830,000 to \$250,000, leaving them but a small skeleton organization until Congress can decide by legislation whether or not they desire to carry it on.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired; all time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOODRUM) there were—ayes 46, noes 37.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. WOODRUM.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 49, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAMILTON: Page 4, line 9, strike out the semicolon and insert a comma and the following: "and out of this amount so appropriated the Secretary of Agriculture shall use such as may be necessary to reimburse small farmer processors of meat and like products for taxes heretofore illegally collected. The Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe such rules as are necessary to make such payments to the proper parties in interest who file their claims by December 31, 1938."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, there are throughout the country thousands of small farmer processors of meat and like products who failed to file by July 1, 1937, their claim for refund of processing taxes found to have been illegally collected. This amendment will take care of that situation. I sincerely hope for its adoption and passage.

While it has been estimated that as much as \$500,000,000 would be required to take care of processing-tax refunds where claims were not filed before the expiration of the time limit for filing July 1, 1937, the amount required for refunds to small farmer processors would be comparatively small. The amount has been estimated as possibly under \$500,000.

Small farmers were in many instances without knowledge of their right to file claim for processing-tax refunds. They should not be penalized under such circumstances. I feel, and I believe the majority of the membership of this House must feel, that where it would take probably less than \$500,000 to make refunds to small farmer processors, here referred to, such action should be taken as would give the required relief.

While the amounts in individual cases may be considered small they are large to those who are affected. We must help those who probably had no means of knowing rights that were theirs but rights that have now expired under the 1936 act of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

I truly hope it may be possible by the adoption of the amendment I have here offered that the deserving, and in many instances the needy small farmer, may be given relief. This is a relief bill we are considering. Why should not the farmer, the small farmer processor, I say, be given relief in the form of refund of processing taxes illegally collected. I say this is the time and place, in this relief bill, to provide for the thousands of small farmer processors all over the United States who lost the opportunity of securing tax refunds simply because they were without the knowledge that they had the right to such refunds. It is not just to hold in the public treasury money illegally collected from any, much less the small farmers who are just now in as much need of relief as any class of our American citizenship suffering from the present depression, recession, or whatever we may call the current condition of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. For the same reason stated by the Chair in sustaining the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL], the Chair sustains the point of order against this amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, we are now considering what might properly be called an omnibus-spending resolution. Omnibus bills brought before the House for consideration can, as a rule, be divided into two classes: First, where similar legislation over which a particular committee has jurisdiction is included in one bill for the purpose of saving time in consideration; second, where like proposals, some of which do not have sufficient justification to guarantee passage by the House, are included together, so that one desiring to vote for the meritorious objective must vote for the undesirable proposal, or be accused of voting against that which he favors. An illustration of the second class was the

omnibus judgeship bill, forced through the House a few days ago. This bill, providing needed judges, carried with it unnecessary judges. The needed judges carried on their backs the unnecessary ones.

The resolution before us consists of three titles:

Title I provides for "work relief and relief."

Title II provides for "Public Works Administration projects."

Title III provides for "Federal public buildings."

Title I purports to provide relief for the needy unemployed. It should not be coupled with the remaining provisions of the bill, which have to do with spending and pump-priming. The two matters should be dealt with in separate bills. The minority committee report makes this fact very clear. I dare say there is not a Member of the House who would vote against or object to providing every dollar of money necessary for actual relief of our people. For my part, I shall be very glad to vote for the \$1,250,000,000 provided for in title I, as recommended by the President, to be spent for relief of our unfortunate friends and neighbors who, through no fault of their own, find themselves in distressed circumstances for the time being. Be it remembered that this amount is called "emergency" and is expected to furnish sufficient relief for but the first 7 months of the new fiscal year—July 1, 1938, to February 1, 1939.

A motion will be offered to send this bill back to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions that the committee report a bill back at once providing that the \$1,250,000,000 for relief shall be contributed by the Federal Government to the States, that it shall reach the reliefer through a bipartisan board set up by the State, and that the necessity for relief shall be passed upon in each case by a nonpolitical local agency. There should be no politics in the distribution of relief. Republicans get hungry and need clothing just the same as Democrats. The political ticket one votes should not be a factor in determining the advisability of providing that individual with the necessities of life or with an honorable job. There has been too much political coercion in the administration of relief, and it is my thought that this element should be removed from the administration of the law.

Titles II and III, providing for Public Works Administration projects and Federal public buildings, should be divorced from this emergency relief legislation. With the changes I have suggested this bill would pass the House almost unanimously. I realize, however, that the bill will pass in any form the administration demands, as long as it carries the vast expenditures to be made in the respective States and in the respective congressional districts. I also realize that this is election year, and that a vast sum of money poured into each congressional district through channels, oftentimes at least, partially controlled by political preferment is most effective, and that it is very difficult for many Members of Congress to vote against appropriations that might, perchance, wield powerful influence in the primaries and elections that are just ahead.

When recently the President asked for \$250,000,000 relief money to care for the needy during the rest of this fiscal year, I voted for that amount because I knew that there was necessity, and, in my remarks found on page 693 in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I made clear my views concerning the relief question as it is now presented to us, and I shall not repeat what I said then.

There is much constructive criticism that can be aimed at the present Federal administration of relief funds. For instance, I do not believe that the cost of the Federal relief bureaucracy, which is over \$125,000,000 a year, is justified, and I am just as convinced that if the motion to recommit, to which I have referred, is adopted, and this matter turned back to the States, the little fellow who needs the help will get more money and the bureaucracy will receive less. Possibly there has been some unjust criticism about "political" relief, yet enough specific instances have been presented to convince any fair-minded person that relief has been used for the purpose of influencing elections, and that the party in power has, and is, taking advantage of this supposedly humanitarian agency in order to perpetuate itself in office. In

short, the political manipulation of relief is now deeply impressed upon the public mind. It is the duty of Congress to remove this psychology by removing the cause, and this can be done as I have suggested. Investigation shows us that relief has become the Nation's fourth largest industry. Only farming, manufacturing, and service industries engage more workers than are getting some form of relief subsidy. More people are obtaining Government aid in one form or another than secure their living from all the mining, public utilities, transportation, and construction employment in the country. This is an appalling situation in the greatest and wealthiest Nation in all the world.

When President Roosevelt came into office, the country was in a terrible condition. Things had grown progressively worse from election day in 1932 until March 4, 1933. No President ever entered the White House with more general support from all of the people. His preelection utterances had given the country to understand that he stood squarely on the Democratic platform of 1932 and would carry out its provisions. He started on this course and the country responded. Things grew rapidly better until the fall of 1933 when the N. R. A. and the real New Deal philosophy for the first time became apparent. We were told that the country must be made over; that our past should be forgotten; that our future should be charted along a new course, and with advisers like Professor Tugwell at the helm, we embarked upon this new philosophy of government. I say "new philosophy." Possibly I should say Old World philosophy, transplanted in the soil of our democracy. We were to have a new form of government, and apparently all effort was expended to reach that objective. One attempted reform followed quickly upon the heels of another. There was a planned economy which, if carried to its logical conclusion, will truly make over our American democracy.

In the meantime, it was necessary to finance our people during the transition and the lending-spending policy came into being. There were those among us who cried out against the folly of our Government spending itself into prosperity. The people evidently had confidence in the New Deal, however, and were willing to give it every chance. For 5 long years we have primed the pump. We have spent more than \$16,000,000,000 in attempting to make the economic pump work. We have increased our national debt from \$21,000,000,000 to approximately \$38,000,000,000 at this good hour, and if this bill which we are now considering becomes a law, that national debt will be more than \$41,000,000,000. The man among us who envisions less than a \$50,000,000,000 national debt in 1940, if we continue this policy, is an optimist indeed.

Our people begin to realize the fallacy of these spending, pump-priming endeavors, and I believe will soon become articulate. I have always said that the masses of our people can be trusted, and usually reach the correct conclusion, when they have the facts. In this instance, hard-headed, American common sense tells all of us that any theory which has for its basis 5 years of stimulants and opiates, and which has utterly failed, should immediately be abandoned.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] pictured the young man in the hospital, who had been bedridden for more than a year, who had had innumerable blood transfusions, who had been kept under the influence of opiates to relieve the pain most of the time. He likened that young man to the condition of our country today, and seemed dumfounded at the thought that the transfusion should be lessened and that the treatment should be changed. He advises more transfusions and more opiates, but no change of treatment.

I cannot agree with his philosophy. It seems to me that new physicians and surgeons should be called in; that new treatment should be decided upon and tried immediately. If the young man has made no progress and is worse off today than he was a year ago, surely something should be done for him. So it is with our country. The country has had 5 years of the same opiates and treatment. We have more men out of work than ever before. We have more people in distress. We are billions more in debt. We have

a weakened morale among our people. Fear—and justified fear—is abroad in the land. We need a different type of treatment. We need a different group of doctors to diagnose our case. This bill will give us neither.

Industry, business, and the investor, large and small, have lost confidence in the Government. This lack of confidence in our Government is no joke. It is a very serious matter. The worst thing that the Government can do for its people is to create a permanent W. P. A. and make it necessary for a large number of our people to rely always upon the Government for jobs. There is no future in W. P. A. employment, any more than there is in the dole. No one wants a permanent dole, and, by the same token, no real American wants a permanent job on W. P. A. at starvation wages.

Wages permitting our people to live according to American standards can only be paid by jobs coming from private industry and private initiative—call it the profit system or what not. Of course, there must be cooperation between industry and government, but there can be no cooperation as long as either industry or government hates and condemns the other. Neither has been perfect in the past. The thing to do is to bury the hatchet, sit down around the table, and go ahead for the common good.

Business can hardly be expected to take the initiative so long as reprisals on the part of the Government are the order of the day and so long as it is taxed beyond all reason. We cannot tax business into prosperity any more than we can spend ourselves into prosperity. We must not lose sight of the fact that every tax dollar makes just one less consumer purchasing dollar. The Government can never pay doles or relief wages that will bring back the purchasing power of our people necessary to consume what we can and should produce. The national income during the last year was almost at a minimum. We must have from ninety to one hundred billion dollars a year of national income if all our people are to be prosperous and live according to American standards, and surely it has been demonstrated that pump priming will not bring that about.

In fact, the old pump is about worn out. The Government is about exhausted in the effort to lift the water from the well, and the more we prime and the more we pump the worse we are off. We are taking the pitcher to the well once too often. The priming dollars are about gone, the taxpayer who has furnished the money to put into the pump has been bled white, he is too weak to withstand further extraction.

Now, we all realize that there will be a temporary economic flurry if this four to six billion dollars is placed in circulation, but mark my words, in the end we will find ourselves worse off than we are today, and then what? There can be but one answer—ruination. That ruination must come about either through disastrous inflation or ignominious repudiation. I cannot conceive of the Congress ever deliberately repudiating all of our obligations. I can conceive of a government, as was done in Germany, taking that which seems to be the easiest way out and drowning its debts in a sea of worthless money.

For these and many other reasons which time prevents my discussing, I am compelled to vote against the pump-priming, spending features of this ill-conceived measure. If the House eliminates these unwise features and the final vote is on the relief item alone as embodied in title I, I shall be pleased to vote for the bill, because that will be relief. The assurance of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] that the passage of this bill will assure the construction of a new post office in every congressional district does not intrigue me. If we want to indulge in a mammoth Government building program, why not let that proposition stand on its own merits and not hitch it up with an emergency relief measure? I refuse to be intimidated by threats or promises or stampeded in the name of relief.

Experience is only valuable as we profit by it. Five years has taught us the futility of what is here proposed. A vote for this bill is in the end not a vote for recovery. Millions for necessary relief but not one cent for proven disastrous

experiments or political pump priming should be our determination.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The funds appropriated in this title to the Works Progress Administration shall be so apportioned and distributed over the period ending January 31, 1939, and shall be so administered during such period as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished to such Administration during such period for relief purposes, and the funds appropriated in this title to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Works Progress Administration for the National Youth Administration, and to the other agencies, shall be so apportioned and distributed over the 12 months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and shall be so administered during such fiscal year as to constitute the total amounts that will be furnished to the Secretary of Agriculture, to the Works Progress Administration for the National Youth Administration, and to the other agencies during such fiscal year for the purposes of this title.

Mr. LANZETTA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANZETTA: Page 6, line 17, after the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That the Works Progress Administration shall so administer the funds allotted to it and so regulate the employment of unemployed persons that no Works Progress Administration worker who cannot find employment in private industry at wages not less than the prevailing rate of wages, for work for which he or she is reasonably fitted by training or experience, shall be discharged from the Works Progress Administration rolls, and that any Works Progress Administration employee securing temporary private employment shall be furloughed during the period of private employment by the Works Progress Administration and not discharged from the rolls: *Provided*, That nothing in this resolution shall be construed to force the Works Progress Administration to continue the employment of any person who is properly dischargeable for cause."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LANZETTA] is the same amendment he offered earlier in the bill. He offers it now to line 17, page 6, as an additional part of section 2. The effect of his amendment is entirely the opposite to that portion of the section which he seeks to amend.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

When this amendment was offered to section 1 of the bill the Chair sustained the point of order because it was clearly not germane to that section. The Chair thinks it is germane to this section.

The question raised by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Woodrum] is one of consistency over which the Chair has no control.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. LANZETTA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, as stated by the gentleman from Virginia, is similar to the amendment which I offered a short time ago. For the benefit of the Members who were not in the Chamber at the time I offered the first amendment, may I say that this amendment embodies the main provisions of House Joint Resolution 440, popularly known as the Schwellenbach-Allen resolution, and provides as follows: First, it prohibits the discharge of W. P. A. workers who cannot find employment in private industry, and second, it permits the furloughing of W. P. A. workers during the period of their unemployment in private industry and allows for their reemployment by the W. P. A. immediately upon the termination of their private employment.

As previously stated, I think that the inclusion of this amendment to the bill now under consideration will help solve our unemployment problem, because it will encourage persons who are on the W. P. A. to seek private employment. These men and women will only seek private employment if they are assured of reinstatement in the event they lose out and cannot find other employment, and unless my amendment is adopted we cannot blame them very much for sticking close to their W. P. A. jobs. This amendment will bring about no harm that I can see, nor will it increase the cost of administering our work-relief program.

With respect to the first proviso of my amendment that no man or woman shall be discharged from the W. P. A. unless he or she can obtain employment in private industry, may I say that this provision will have a salutary effect, first, because it will keep these workers off the unemployment rolls at a time when workers from private industry are being added to it, and second, it will prevent the chiselers in industry from taking advantage of a labor glut on the market by reducing wages and increasing the hours of labor.

This amendment does not increase the appropriation. It gives the W. P. A. workers a chance to have a job until such time as they can find outside employment and it also gives them an opportunity to seek and obtain outside employment and to be reinstated if and when they lose their jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, of course, this amendment is a direct reversal of all the policy that is contained in the relief bill. In the first place it declares the policy to be to give a job to everybody who is out of work.

Mr. LANZETTA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. No, I cannot yield.

Mr. LANZETTA. For the purpose of correction.

Mr. WOODRUM. Oh, I do not need any correction. I cannot yield to the gentleman, because I have only 2 minutes. That is what the amendment states.

Mr. LANZETTA. I struck out the first sentence, I may say to the gentleman from Virginia, and my amendment begins with the second sentence.

Mr. WOODRUM. All right. The C. I. O., the American Federation of Labor, and the Workers' Alliance all came before our committee. None of them made any complaint about the adequacy of this program, appropriating as it does for about 4,000,000 jobs. Under this amendment a man not only has to be given a job but if he gets a job in private industry his job must be kept for him until he comes back, if he ever wants to come back to it. You have to furlough him and save the job and save the money for him. It will absolutely destroy the effect of this relief bill to write an amendment of this kind into it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope very much the amendment will not be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LANZETTA].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANZETTA) there were—ayes 13, noes 61.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOILEAU: On page 6, line 1, strike out all of section 2.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, this section is similar to the so-called Woodrum amendment that was put in the bill last year and which, in my judgment, caused a great deal of hardship throughout the country. However, this section goes further than the amendment of last year did. So far as this section applies only to the W. P. A. I do not believe there will be any objection, because the funds appropriated for the W. P. A. in this bill are for the period beginning July 1 and ending January 31, a 7-month period, during which we are not going to be in session. Therefore, we have to appropriate enough money now to cover that 7-month period, so section 2, so far as the W. P. A. funds are concerned, is unnecessary and at the same time unimportant. I do not believe there is any real objection to it. The section should not be in the bill, in my judgment, but it does not make much difference because we will not be in session,

and the money that is made available for W. P. A. will, of necessity, have to be spent over this 7-month period.

However, section 2 goes one step further, which, in my judgment, does make a big difference, because it provides that the \$175,000,000 appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture for relief and loans and rural rehabilitation for needy persons must be spent over the entire fiscal year; that is, it must be so spent by the Secretary of Agriculture that the \$175,000,000 will last the entire 12 months. I maintain this is discriminating against agriculture. We are appropriating for the W. P. A. only for the 7-month period, until we return at the next session, but we say the amount we are appropriating to the Secretary of Agriculture for relief to the farmers must be spent over the entire 12-month period, so there will be an average of approximately \$14,500,000 per month over the 12 months. If we knew at this time exactly when the farmers were going to need this kind of assistance, it might be all right, but we do not know when the drought will require more aid for the agricultural area. The drought might come early and its results might be more disastrous than are now anticipated. We might have a terrible condition during this summer and this fall as far as agriculture is concerned, but still, under the provisions of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture would be required so to disburse these funds as to make them spread over the 12-month period. I maintain the Secretary of Agriculture in this rehabilitation work among the farmers should have a free range to administer the funds in such a way as to relieve human misery and relieve the conditions among the people in the agricultural sections of this country. If they are in need of assistance during this summer and this fall, he should spend such part of this money as is necessary properly to give relief to them.

I maintain, therefore, that as far as the W. P. A. is concerned, the striking out of section 2 will have no effect; but if you strike out section 2, then, as far as agriculture is concerned, you will give the Secretary of Agriculture the right to use all of the \$175,000,000 between now and the time Congress reconvenes, if in his judgment and the judgment of the administration the expenditure of that amount of money is absolutely necessary for the relief of the people in the agricultural sections of the country. I appeal to the membership of the House to strike out this section. It will do no harm to the W. P. A. program, but it will enable the Secretary of Agriculture to administer these funds for the rehabilitation of the people engaged in agriculture in larger amounts if such larger amounts are needed during this fall and before Congress reconvenes.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, the committee in allocating these amounts and in providing for a 7-month period for W. P. A. followed the recommendations not only of the Works Progress Administration, but the other groups interested in relief. They raised no objection to this provision.

With reference to the Farm Security Administration the committee has given them every penny they said they needed for their program for 12 months, which is \$175,000,000 for next year as against \$125,000,000 for comparable purposes for this fiscal year. This is every penny they said they would need for the 12-month period, and the same thing is true of the National Youth Administration, which was given \$75,000,000 as against \$52,500,000 for the last 12-month period.

These agencies had no hesitancy in saying that they could estimate with reasonable accuracy what their requirements would be, and this provision does not require the funds to be allocated on an equal monthly basis. They can use it any way they see fit during this period. The Secretary of Agriculture made no complaint about it and is perfectly satisfied that the amount of money under this provision will

enable the Farm Security Administration to meet the situation as it may exist.

If any great emergency should arise Congress will still be here. I am afraid we will be here for some time to come yet, and we will certainly be here in January.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. But the intention is to prohibit them from using all of this fund between now and January.

Mr. WOODRUM. No; they can apportion it over a 12-month period in any way they may determine.

Mr. BOILEAU. If the Secretary of Agriculture should determine that the whole sum of \$175,000,000 should be used between now and February, would he have the right to do so?

Mr. WOODRUM. He would have that right, but would have nothing to spend for the other months unless Congress gave it to him.

Mr. BOILEAU. Then this section means nothing.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman is borrowing trouble. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Farm Security Administration and the groups interested in the matter do not find or anticipate any such danger as the gentleman is conjuring up in his imagination.

Mr. BOILEAU. I submit the Secretary of Agriculture is not going to be able to tell what kind of weather we are going to have. He may be a very able man, but he cannot do that.

Mr. WOODRUM. I think the Secretary of Agriculture and the Farm Security Administration have been willing always to ask for what they needed and we have given them just that.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an administrative provision in this bill which is logical and orderly and in the interest of administering this program not only to meet relief, but with some regard to protection of the Treasury of the United States. We have given the Farm Security Administration \$175,000,000, which is the amount they say they need for their 12-month period, and certainly no one can find fault with that. They have not been cut a penny and this is \$50,000,000 more than they have for the current year.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOILEAU. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy and I submit that I am willing to withdraw my amendment if the gentleman will say unequivocally, here and now, that the Secretary of Agriculture can, if he sees fit to do so, and if it is necessary for purposes of relief, spend the entire \$175,000,000 between now and the first of February.

Mr. WOODRUM. I think he can apportion it over that period according to his judgment and this provision. Of course, he must go to the Budget and the Budget regulates the allocation. The gentleman knows that W. P. A., working last year under this amendment, did not spend the money in equal monthly installments.

Mr. BOILEAU. I know that.

Mr. WOODRUM. And that is what the Secretary of Agriculture will do in this instance. He has given himself some leeway and has asked for every penny he thought would be needed.

Mr. Chairman, I hope very much the gentleman's amendment will not be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOILEAU) there were—ayes 10, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 3. The Administrator of the Works Progress Administration is authorized to allocate to other Federal departments, establishments, and agencies, for the purpose of operating projects of the types specified for the Works Progress Administration under section 1 of this title, including administrative expenses of any such

department, establishment, or agency incident to the operation of such projects, not to exceed \$50,000,000 of the funds made available by such section to such Administration and to prescribe rules and regulations for the operation of such projects: *Provided*, That not to exceed 5 percent of the total amount so allotted to any such department, establishment, or agency shall be expended for such administrative expenses.

Sec. 4. The Works Progress Administration, the National Youth Administration within the Works Progress Administration, the Farm Security Administration within the Department of Agriculture, the National Emergency Council, the National Resources Committee, and the Prison Industries Reorganization Board, are hereby extended until June 30, 1939, to carry out the purposes of this title.

Sec. 5. No Federal construction project, except flood-control and water-conservation projects authorized under other law, shall be undertaken or prosecuted under the appropriations in this title unless and until there shall have been allocated and irrevocably set aside Federal funds sufficient for its completion; and no non-Federal project shall be undertaken or prosecuted under such appropriations unless and until the sponsor has made a written agreement to finance such part of the entire cost thereof as is not to be supplied from Federal funds.

Sec. 6. Federal agencies having supervision of projects prosecuted under the appropriations in this title are authorized to receive from sponsors of non-Federal projects contributions in services, materials, or money, such money to be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States. Such contributions shall be expended or utilized as agreed upon between the sponsor and the Federal agency.

Sec. 7. In carrying out the purposes of this title, the heads of the departments, establishments, and agencies to which funds are appropriated herein are authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary.

Sec. 8. The appropriations in this title for administrative expenses and such portion of other appropriations in this title as are available for administrative expenses shall not be obligated for such administrative expenses in excess of the amounts which the department, establishment, or agency, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall have certified to the Secretary of the Treasury as necessary for such purposes. The amounts so certified for administrative expenses shall be available for expenditure by such department, establishment, or agency concerned for personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere and for the objects set forth in subsection (a) of section 3 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 and with the authority set forth in subsection (b) of such section of such act: *Provided*, That not to exceed 5 percent of the amount made available in section 1 of this title to the Works Progress Administration and to the Works Progress Administration for the National Youth Administration shall be used for administration.

Sec. 9. The rates of pay for persons engaged upon projects under the appropriations in this title shall be not less than the prevailing rates of pay for work of a similar nature in the same locality as determined by the Works Progress Administration.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MASSINGALE: Page 9, line 7, strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided*, That the monthly rate of pay for persons employed on projects financed by funds or allotments from this appropriation shall not be less than \$32, notwithstanding existing laws or regulations to the contrary."

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment for the purpose of trying to adjust some of the inequities that obtain in the administration of the Works Progress Administration in regard to payments to W. P. A. workers. I can illustrate it in this way. In Oklahoma we are in what is called region 3. The minimum scale there is \$19 a month. Just across the section line in Kansas, the minimum wage is \$32. The \$19 scale applies in I do not know how many counties in Oklahoma, and in nearly all of the Southern States. That is not fair. It takes just as much manual labor to dig a ditch in Oklahoma as it does in New York or Ohio, and a man has to eat just as much food, and it costs, in all probability, just as much money to buy it. Our people are asking no particular benefits. We do not want any favors, but it is not right. It is manifestly unjust and wrong to require a man living in Oklahoma, where the maximum wage is \$23.10 a month, to work for as little as \$19 a month, while a man in New York gets \$55 and \$65 a month and a man in Kansas and in a tier of counties in the Panhandle of Texas gets from \$32 to \$45 a month. We want to do away with those inequities, we want our people to pay the same scale there that they get in these adjoining States.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASSINGALE. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. I am sorry I did not hear the reading of the gentleman's amendment, but as I understand it his amendment is not directed at the differentials but aims to fix a minimum floor.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Yes; it fixes a floor.

Mr. TARVER. And there will be nothing in the gentleman's amendment to prevent whatever differential the Works Progress Administration desires to adopt.

Mr. MASSINGALE. That is correct. I have read the amendment that the gentleman from Georgia proposes to offer, and I think it is fair and I am going to support it, but I think we ought to have a minimum wage fixed for this work, and I know of no reason why a man should be penalized who happens to live in Oklahoma or in Georgia. He ought to get just as much pay for the same kind of work that he gets in any other State.

Mr. MAY. In other words, the effect of the gentleman's amendment is to eliminate the differentials to the extent of fixing a minimum below which they cannot go.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Yes; to fix a minimum below which they cannot go and below which they ought not to go.

Mr. MAY. And they will not be permitted to if this amendment becomes a law.

Mr. MASSINGALE. That is correct. They will not be able to go below \$32 a month.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a substitute for the Massingale amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER as a substitute for the Massingale amendment: Page 9, line 7, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That no differentials in such rates of pay exceeding 10 percent of the maximum rates shall be fixed as between different States or areas of the same general types in the several States."

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that this is really not a substitute for my amendment. My amendment deals with an entirely different matter from that which the gentleman from Georgia proposes. My amendment fixes a place below which Mr. Hopkins, by any administrative order, cannot go in fixing the wage scale. The gentleman from Georgia proposes in his amendment an entirely different proposition.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the Chair sustaining the point of order. I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana to the amendment offered by Mr. MASSINGALE: Strike out of the amendment "\$32," and insert in lieu thereof "\$40."

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, W. P. A. wages today are based on three regional scales, \$40 in region No. 1, \$30 in region No. 2, and \$21 in region No. 3, which is the South. I have prepared statistics on the cost of living gathered from these various cities. The cost of living in New York is about 4 percent less than it is in Washington, yet New York is in region No. 1 and Washington is in region No. 2. The cost of living in New York is 6 percent higher than it is in Atlanta. The cost of living in Cincinnati is 6 percent higher than it is in Memphis. The cost of living in Boston is 5 percent higher than it is in New Orleans, and in Buffalo it is 5 percent higher than it is in New Orleans. All of the northern cities pay monthly W. P. A. wages 100 percent higher than the southern wage scale. I say that these arbitrary and discriminatory wage regions should be abolished and a minimum of \$40 a month established nationally. It cannot be seriously contended that a person in the South can live on \$21 a month, or that they can do this in any other place in the United States and support a family. For the past year both the President and the Members of this Congress have been demanding the enactment of wage and hour legislation. I say it is high time that the Government itself show that it, too, wants higher wages, that it, too, wants maximum hours;

and I say that through the W. P. A. that ought to be done. I do not know how any of you southerners can go back to your people on W. P. A. and in any way maintain and stand for that kind of provision that pays them only \$21 a month when people in the North are making \$40 and \$60 a month.

I know a great many Members of Congress oppose the wage-hour bill because there are no differentials in it, but I ask you sincerely to support this amendment for \$40 as a minimum. If this amendment is adopted I intend to offer an amendment providing for a 30 cents an hour minimum as far as hours are concerned; and I appeal to you people in the North who are for a wage and hour bill, who are for wage and hour legislation, to support this amendment, to show your support of the wage-hour legislation on which we will have a fight. Show it today by supporting this amendment. I sincerely hope and trust that it will prevail.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman gave the wages in the North as \$44 a month.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. No; I gave the cost of living showing that on the basis of the cost of living there was no reason whatsoever for the differentials which now exist, that the cost of living was so nearly equal in all the large cities of the country that there was no reason for such differentials.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman tell us what the mayor of Jersey City is paying? [Laughter.]

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. Mayor Hague—I sincerely hope that I will not be ruled out of order—Mayor Hague, whom I think is the most despicable man alive in the United States today, whose name is synonymous with everything that is rotten and low in American politics, whose name is synonymous with graft, and corruption, and scandal, who is violating the American Constitution and everything that is American; I say if he had his way they would be paying in New Jersey cities in a lot of New Jersey industries 15 and 17 cents an hour; and I say that this is another way to show your hatred and your detestation for Mayor Hague's violation of the American Constitution and my rights, voting for this amendment. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the question of minimum wages as paid by the United States Government. Pending in the Congress of the United States at the present time is a wage and hour bill, to which most of our southern Members have been bitterly opposed. They oppose the wage and hour bill on the ground it does not make a substantial differentiation between the southern sections of the United States and the northern sections. Those of us who are protagonists of the O'Connell amendment propose that the United States Government shall set the example by establishing a minimum wage of \$40 a month for W. P. A. workers. I reiterate the utterances to which the gentleman from Montana has just given expression. That is, I question the political wisdom of any southern Member of the House of Representatives going back into his district displaying a record of having opposed an amendment which provides for raising the minimum for the W. P. A. residents of his own congressional district. God knows the United States Government should set the example in providing minimum wages. God knows no gentleman can get up on the floor of this House and attempt for one minute to justify logically advocating a wage of \$19 per month. The cost of living differential between North and South in the cities of the land averages about 10 percent, yet we are paying as low as \$19 per month in the States of Oklahoma and in many of our Southern and Southwestern States, whereas in the North we are paying \$55 a month in many of the industrial sections. There is no such differential in the cost of living. There is no such differential that can be set up through any form of argument that may be made.

Mr. BRADLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I say that in some cities it is \$60.50.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I have been so advised.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. The statement has been made on the floor of the House that the State of Pennsylvania will get more under this bill than eight Southern States. That is a terrible condition if true. Does the gentleman understand that statement is correct?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. BRADLEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY. With reference to Pennsylvania, may I say that although I come from a city which, due to the actions of a Republican council, has not for the last 3 or 4 years utilized the Federal money, although we have eligible for employment about 40,000 people who are denied aid through the political work of the Republican council; yet I as a Philadelphian, despite the fact we cannot get this money for our own unemployed, am willing to vote to give it to other needy people of the country.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. My friend from Washington is insisting on the southern Members voting for this amendment to do away with a differential. Will the gentleman point out to the Members of the Northern States who are insisting on no differential in the wage and hour bill and tell them if they do not vote for this amendment for no differential they should not vote for one in the wage and hour bill?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I will take that under advisement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will not thoughtlessly undertake to settle the wage and hour problem in this relief bill. I know you will not do it if you think the matter over carefully. I cannot understand how some of my colleagues here can object to voting for a wage and hour bill because it does not contain differentials and now undertake to write a provision into this bill eliminating differentials. I cannot understand how Members all over the House are refusing to put a differential in the wage and hour bill when in a few minutes they will insist on having a differential in this bill.

The answer to that whole matter is that this is not the place to settle the wage and hour problem. May I call to your attention that some of you gentleman have claimed this program did not furnish enough jobs? You have passed that part of the bill dealing with the money. You have frozen that provision. If you increase the compensation of any man in this bill you thereby take somebody off the relief roll because we have passed that part of the bill which provides the money.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If you place them uniformly throughout the Nation you will not take anybody off the roll. If this is made uniform throughout the Nation, nobody will be taken off the roll.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is not to make it uniform. It is to put a bottom under it and raise the wage to \$40 a month or to \$32 a month. Now, every time you write a provision into this bill raising the wage or the compensation of anybody you are making fewer jobs for the unemployed. This is not the time nor the place to do that.

I do not know whether there are inequities. Perhaps there are. Perhaps in some places the wage is too small. But

there are jobs to be made available and of this \$1,250,000,000 you are going to be allotted a certain amount of money for jobs for your unemployed. If you provide a minimum of \$40 a month you will have fewer jobs. You may raise the wages of some fellows from \$10 to \$40 a month, some of your farm hands, for instance, but you will have fewer jobs to go around for the unemployed if you do that.

I hope very much the Committee in this bill which seeks to meet an emergency will not undertake to disturb the equilibrium and the system under which relief has been administered. We of the majority feel a good job has been done, as good a job as anyone could do under the circumstances. I hope very much all amendments which undertake in this part of the bill to interfere with the rates of pay will not be voted into the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana) there were—ayes 19, noes 91.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, may we have the Massingale amendment again reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Massingale amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOODRUM) there were—ayes 49, noes 74.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment I submitted a while ago.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 9, line 7, strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "Provided, That no differentials in such rates of pay exceeding 10 percent of the maximum rates shall be fixed as between different States or areas of the same general types in the several States."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I sought to give to the House reasons which I thought justified the adoption of this amendment. As you have noticed, it does not provide for a minimum wage. It does provide there shall not be discrimination to the extent of more than 10 percent between workers of the same type performing the same character of work in substantially similar areas in the different portions of the country. One of the gentlemen who has addressed you today has already pointed out that as between unskilled labor in one division in region No. 1 and similar labor in the same division in region No. 3 there is a difference of the amount between \$40 and \$21. This, however, is applicable only to one division. I ask you, if you will, to turn to page 6678 of yesterday's Record and inform yourselves as to the full amount of the discriminations that are provided for in the existing W. P. A. wage rates. I was advised by the Works Progress Administration this morning that in region No. 3, which includes the South, the hourly rate of pay for unskilled workers in subdivision (e) is 16 cents, whereas in region No. 1 the hourly rate of pay for the same type of workers in similar areas is 38 cents. There is, therefore, not only the discrimination as between \$40 per month paid in region No. 1 for this class of workers and \$21 per month paid in region No. 3, but there is the additional fact that in region No. 3, if you will figure it out, it requires 131¼ hours for a W. P. A. worker to earn his small wage of \$21 per month, whereas in region No. 1 the same kind of worker can earn his wage of \$40 per month in 105 hours. The region 3 worker not only gets less money by about 100 percent of his wages but he has an hourly wage rate which is much more out of proportion than the total amounts received by the two classes

of workers and he works a good many more hours a month to earn his smaller stipend than the man does in region No. 1 who performs the same type of work.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to state the wage rate was 16 cents an hour in the gentleman's area and 38 cents in the other?

Mr. TARVER. Thirty-eight cents in the other area for exactly the same type of work by the same type of worker.

Mr. BOILEAU. Does not the law now require that the prevailing hourly wage be paid?

Mr. TARVER. The law so requires.

Mr. BOILEAU. Is not that indicative of the fact, then, that the prevailing wage is more than twice as high up in the other area as it is in the gentleman's area?

Mr. TARVER. I do not believe it is. That would be to assume the law is being carried out in the spirit in which it was enacted by the Congress.

The question which is involved here is whether or not for the same character of work, resulting in the same benefit to the public, performed by a W. P. A. worker who happens to reside in one section of the country, you are willing to provide substantially the same wage that may be paid to another W. P. A. worker in another section of the country. My amendment does permit a small differential, which I think might be justified by the difference in cost of living. As has been indicated by one of the gentlemen who has addressed you, there is a difference of perhaps 10 percent as between certain areas in this country in respect to the cost of living. I am not opposed to taking that into consideration in the fixing of W. P. A. wages, as my amendment would do that, but if you permit the present practices to be carried on, then differentials are allowed and enforced ranging to 200 or 300 percent. I say that is manifestly unfair and unjust.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. BOILEAU. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. WEST. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. The gentleman has moved that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes. Does the gentleman mean on this amendment or the section?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman stated on the pending amendment.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, does the motion apply to amendments to the amendment or substitute amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. It would apply to amendments to the pending amendment.

The gentleman from Virginia moves that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BOILEAU moves that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I regret the necessity of using this means of getting the floor, but I want to reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

I have a very high and wholesome regard for the gentleman from Georgia, but the gentleman has talked about the differential between wages paid in the South and in the North on W. P. A. I want to call the attention of the membership of the House to the fact that as I understand the law it provides that the prevailing hourly rate of wages shall be paid, and the reason you are only getting 16 cents an hour in the South is because you have not any higher wage levels in the South. [Applause.]

Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia and also to other gentlemen who are interested in the matter that if you want more than 16 cents an hour for your W. P. A. workers all you have got to do is to join with us on May 23 and pass the bill that fixes a minimum hourly wage of 25 cents, which will mean that that shall be the prevailing rate of wages and you gentlemen will get your 25 cents an hour as the prevailing hourly rate of wages.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I am sorry the gentleman did not hear what I said yesterday or read it in the RECORD today. I indicated my position with regard to wage and hour legislation. The gentleman is mistaken in thinking that the wage and hour bill would apply to W. P. A., because that bill has nothing to do with it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Yes, it has; because it provides that the prevailing hourly rate shall be paid, and if you fix 25 cents as the minimum in your community, that is the prevailing hourly rate.

Mr. KITCHENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. KITCHENS. Will the gentleman take the position that the poor devil who cannot get a job in my section of the country should be discriminated against in comparison with a man in your section or in the northern section who cannot get a job because of the action of somebody who has nothing whatever to do with his condition?

Mr. BOILEAU. I just wanted to bring out this point, and I want also to say that last year I offered an amendment upon this floor that would have provided for a minimum of \$40 a month to the fellows in the South. I offered an amendment to increase the W. P. A. appropriation from one billion and a half to three billion dollars. The only way you can get this higher rate is to raise the amount of money, and I submit that the gentleman from Georgia was one of the gentlemen who took the floor and started his remarks by saying, "Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin."

The way to get your high wages is to appropriate the money to pay them, and this amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia does not increase the appropriation. So, what you are proposing to do is not going to increase the level of wages.

Those of us who want to provide decent standards for our people do not want to be dragged down to a level of \$20 a month. We want you to increase the standard.

I submit that last year when gentlemen from the South opposed my amendment and then supported an amendment to cut the committee's recommendation from one billion and a half dollars to one billion dollars, they were either wrong then or they are wrong today. I submit they were wrong both times. What they should do is to increase the appropriation in this bill so that we can get a \$40 minimum. We offered that to you just a moment ago, and many northern Members supported it. I know that all the so-called liberals in the House supported that \$40 minimum. Do not try to bring the red herring of the wage and hour bill across the path here, because if you are sincere in wanting to get higher wages, you will support the wage and hour bill and you will get at least 25 cents an hour for your W. P. A. labor.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. In one county in my district, Jefferson, the minimum-wage rate is far in excess of \$40. It runs from \$60 to \$70, and yet the W. P. A. wage scale is about \$32 a month.

Mr. BOILEAU. The hourly rate is what you go on. That is what governs in the situation, and if your people are not getting the prevailing hourly wage rate there is something wrong with your administration.

I for one am not going to assume that responsibility. That is a democratic proposition that the Democrats must work out. We want the prevailing rate of wages to be paid. Bring up something and you will get our support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. Of course, I am opposed to striking out the enacting clause of the resolution, but I take this opportunity as the gentleman from Wisconsin did to say a few words in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. What does the gentleman from Georgia want to do? If his amendment prevails, you will be paying people in his community a salary higher than they ever received, and who would never want to go back to employment in private industry. If employed in private industry now they would resign so they could get on P. W. A. Nobody down in his country, engaged in private business, would pay 10 percent of the prevailing rate of wage that is paid in my city of St. Louis or in New York or in any other big city of the Union. They never have and they never will, unless the Congress requires those engaged in interstate commerce to pay it, by passing a wage and hour bill. Now the truth of the matter is if you had never heard of a wage and hour bill you never would have heard of this amendment. You have listened to the gentleman from Georgia, listen to others and their argument will confirm this statement.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Just a moment. This is a relief bill. It is a necessity or we would not be passing it. There is not a man or woman in this House who would not be very happy if conditions in the country did not require the passage of this legislation, but the conditions exist, we are forced to meet the situation, and if we do not pass the legislation there will be riots in every community of the country. Each and every Member here knows that, because the people of this country who have wives and children are going to eat. The only way they are going to eat is to work, and when they cannot get work in private industry the Government of the United States must come to their rescue, and will no matter what political party is in control. I want the rate of wages increased in the South, but this is not the way to increase them. Gentlemen of the South know that just as well as I do.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. In just a moment. If the Members from the South want to get the amount of money paid to the people of your community that is being paid in other parts of the country, raise the prevailing rate of wage in your community in private industry, and then the W. P. A. will be required to pay that.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman, of course, is not in favor of men working for 16 cents an hour, either north or south.

Mr. COCHRAN. Absolutely not; and I want the people in the South to pay their people a decent rate of wage, but this is not the way to accomplish that. This is but a gesture. Those opposed to the wage and hour bill who want differentials in that bill are the ones who will vote for this amendment. If they desired to raise the wages of the laboring men and women in the South they would not want differentials. The wage and hour bill, if enacted into law, would

raise the salaries, and when that wage level is increased, then automatically, under this bill, W. P. A. wages increase.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. DIES. Does the gentleman think that the Government should pay to labor less than it asks industry to pay?

Mr. COCHRAN. I say to the gentleman from Texas that if he will join with us and pass a wage and hour bill, then they will have a decent rate of wage in the South in industry, and when that occurs, as I just stated, under this bill, Harry Hopkins or whoever is head of W. P. A. will be compelled to increase the wage of the W. P. A. worker.

Mr. DIES. But the gentleman now has a good opportunity to demonstrate whether he is sincere, when he says there ought to be a uniform wage.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, I have the opportunity to be sincere, but this is not the way to do it. The gentleman knows that just as well as I do. This is not the way to raise the rate of wage of people working in industry in the South.

Mr. DIES. Would the gentleman ask them to pay more than the Government?

Mr. COCHRAN. Why, certainly not. You need no such legislation as this amendment proposes in order to have the Government pay just as much as industry pays in the South. Read the section. Here is what it says:

The rates of pay for persons engaged upon projects under the appropriations in this title shall be not less than the prevailing rates of pay for work of a similar nature in the same locality as determined by the Works Progress Administration.

That is plain language, based upon the pay for work of a similar nature in the same locality. Therefore, if we in the large cities pay a certain rate, W. P. A. must pay the same rate. That is going to be the law—not rule or regulation. Therefore, if you will raise the rate of pay of the people you represent, no matter how high you go, W. P. A. must meet that rate when it employs men and women to do similar work. There can be no question about that.

The amendment of the gentleman from Georgia might go even further than he intends. If the amendment is adopted, it might be so construed by those administering the act that they might be required or would have the right to reduce the pay in certain localities. We do not want that. The good Lord knows our people are barely able to exist on what they are getting now from W. P. A.

I am for a higher standard of living in the South for the working man and woman and his family. I am for better wages for the working people of the South, but I insist, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the way to reach that objective. If the people from the South are sincere and want the W. P. A. worker in their locality to get the same wage we pay W. P. A. workers in the North, just raise your wages in industry to our level, and you get the increase.

You know and I know what will happen if W. P. A. wages are raised above that paid the worker in industry in the South. Everyone will want to work for W. P. A. This amendment should and will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin that the Committee do now rise and report the joint resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out. The question was taken; and the motion was rejected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, for sometime I have been planning when this bill came up to offer an amendment to provide for uniform wages for Federal workers on W. P. A. But when I learned that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], who is a member of the committee, was going to offer this amendment, I decided to support it rather than to seek to have my own adopted.

In February of this year I asked Colonel Harrington, Assistant Administrator, for a schedule of wages paid to W. P. A. workers in the several States. I was furnished a chart showing the three regions in the Nation, with their different rates of pay. The injustice of these rates as shown in the table at page 316 of the hearings is obvious. It shows, Mr. Chairman, that in my State, Arkansas, the average monthly wages paid to W. P. A. workers for unskilled labor is \$26.40. There are only four other States that are paid less, all of them being Southern States—North Carolina, \$23.90, which is the lowest paid in any State; Kentucky, \$25.60; Mississippi, \$24.33; and South Carolina, \$26.22. Now compare these wages with those paid for the same work from the same Treasury by the same Government in these States:

Illinois.....	\$54.20
California.....	59.83
Connecticut.....	64.33
Pennsylvania.....	59.97
Ohio.....	55.45
New York.....	60.90
New York City.....	72.23

This presents an ugly picture, one that cannot be justified. I have read with interest the testimony of the W. P. A. Administrator in the hearings last year where, on page 81, there appears:

WAGE SCALES

Mr. HOPKINS. Partly, no doubt. Of course, I think our wage scale is not based much on the cost of living as it is on the standard of living.

For instance, our figures show that it costs as much for a worker to live in Washington as it does in New York, and certainly the difference between the wages we pay in New York City and Charleston, S. C., does not represent a difference in the actual needs of the workers. The difference is rather in the standard of living.

Senator RUSSELL. That is a very good statement. Undoubtedly the difference in the standard of living has been very largely accepted in fixing these wage scales.

Mr. HOPKINS. There is no question about it.

Based on standard of living and not on need, standard of living and not on justice or equity, not on cost of living, not on need or equality, but on an arbitrary and questionable basis of standard of living.

The W. P. A. workers in the South do not merit this harsh and unreasonable discrimination. Their standard of living is not as bad as these different wages indicate. The standard of living of southern workers compares favorably with those who live in the tenements of the large cities.

The workers of the South perform the same service as those in these favored States, and yet they are compelled to suffer this great injustice. Our citizens of the South on W. P. A. shed just as much perspiration, they sweat and give just as much of their strength, and are just as loyal to our flag and just as deserving as the relief workers of these other States who are paid from two to three times as much.

These low wages are not based on prevailing wages, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] states, but on so-called standards of living that are arbitrarily assumed or fixed by some authority in the W. P. A. I know the prevailing wages in my State are much higher, except possibly in the cotton fields where we are trying to produce cotton at 8 cents per pound and cannot possibly pay higher wages so long as the price of farm products remains below the cost of production.

Some of you profess to want to do something for the South. Now you have a chance. Vote for this amendment if you are sincere in your professed desire to raise wages of southern laborers. Let the Federal Government set the example. Let it show good faith and not promulgate rules and impose on one section while showing preferential consideration to many other States.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] says this is a relief bill. The man in the South on relief, who has a wife and five children, has seven mouths to feed. It takes just as much food for them to live as it does for the workers in these other States. It costs them practically as much to live. The

Government requires the same amount of work from them as it does from the northern workers and pays them less than half. If that is justice, it is a peculiar brand. The Government makes no such differences in other employees. It should be fair to all on relief and not penalize those from the South. The pending amendment should be adopted. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in favor of the amendment as offered. I would prefer to have it uniform, instead of 10 percent differential, but the wage-hour bill proposes a graduated schedule of wages and hours over a short period of time, so it would be fair in W. P. A. to do it that way.

A man can be just as hungry in Georgia or Florida as he can in Chicago or New York City. He can do just as efficient labor in the State of Washington as he can in the State of Massachusetts. It is obvious that the House is going to pass the wage-hour bill; I think it is generally conceded that a wage-hour bill will pass. If this W. P. A. bill goes through the House without putting in a uniform wage scale where can it be done? It will be beyond us. If you intend to have uniform W. P. A. wages and hours this is the time and place to do it; and you gentlemen who are so desirous of wage and hour legislation—and I concede there is merit to it although I know that a number of industries down our way will be dried up, but that is conceded—you men should support this amendment. Those men who will have to go from industry to relief roll in the South ought to be paid just the same as all others are paid under like circumstances.

I think it is only right and fair that a man's hunger and his need should be taken care of the same way in all sections of the country. If we are going to unify everything in the United States and centralize everything in Washington, why not have a uniform wage on W. P. A.? It is right, it is fair, it is a thing that all of us can agree on. All who want uniform wages, uniform hours, and a unified country can agree on this. In all fairness the amendment should be adopted. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, I am shocked that any Member of this House of Representatives that is for the wage and hour bill could be against the proposition that is put up to us today. [Applause.] You talk about making the South, forcing the South to pay minimum wages, and yet you say a southerner should get a half or a third on W. P. A. as other parts of the country.

I want to tell you that I am one southerner that gets pretty sick at some of the treatment given the South, especially as I happen to be one who often goes along with these Yankees [laughter] and suchlike. I get pretty sick when I see Louisiana and Mississippi and Texas treated as though they were not parts of the United States. You who yowl about justice, why, be consistent.

THE LOWER STANDARDS OF THE SOUTH—RAISE THEM!

What did Harry Hopkins say? Mr. Hopkins said that the reason they did not pay more in Texas and Louisiana was because there was a lower standard there, not because it cost less to live. It costs possibly 5 or 10 percent less.

If you intend to legislate on the basis that the United States of America is one country, when are you going to start to do it?

Why, you northern and western Democrats came in here and asked us to vote for the antilynching bill, and I did. You came in here and asked us to vote for a wage-hour bill, and I did. Well, then, you ought to be fair to the southern part of the United States. [Applause.]

My friends, this is a nation—and we are supposed to legislate for a nation. You denounce sectionalism in the South. So do not be sectional yourselves.

I get cussed by both sides. I know it.

BE FAIR TO THE SOUTH AS THE WHOLE NATION

Sure, I know how it is, but I will tell you that if you vote this down you are doing something that is unfair; you are doing something against the Democratic Party and against the United States of America.

My people get low wages. I have pressure exerted from people down there to vote against the Minimum Wage Act. Why am I voting for it? Because I want my people to get the same wages as they get in Massachusetts, New York, and the rest of the States.

Listen! You people from Pennsylvania, from New Jersey, and all the rest of those States have talked so piously about high wages, minimum wages.

Why do not you come clean on this thing? You come clean on the W. P. A. and those from the South will come clean with you. May I say the only square thing to do is to come across. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'MALLEY] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, for the first time I realize that like in India we have a class of untouchables in this country, the industrialists of one section who will not pay decent wages. The thing that surprises me is that those untouchables have never been attacked by these defenders of the poor relief worker who have spoken here today in favor of this purely demagogic amendment.

These were never wages to begin with. There is no question about these being wages. They are just a dole under the disguise of wages. All we can do, if we hope to settle the relief question, is to pay enough through this disguised dole in all sections of the country to make it possible for these people on relief to get enough to eat. We know it costs more in the North to live. You have to buy coal, you have to have a house that is warm, whereas in the South they do not have those expenses.

The thing that amazes me today more than anything else is the flood of oratory about equal rights and equal wages when the money comes from the Treasury, and the astonishing lack of oratory about those same rights when the money would come from the industrialists in those sections where starvation wages are being paid. I see no reason why the Treasury of the United States when it is called upon to provide relief should have to pay more in any section than is necessary to sustain these people upon relief until employment in private industry is available, because if we do that we are putting Uncle Sam in the position of competing with private industry. The men behind this amendment are advocating that the United States Treasury, through the relief rolls, be put in competition with the very industries they have been trying to protect by their opposition to the wage and hour bill. Hardly a consistent position. The greatest inconsistency of all, however, is to say in effect, as the advocates of this amendment say by implication to their people, "We are opposed to a wage-hour limit for industry, but we demand one for relief. We do not care how little you get paid, how long you work, or what your employer does to you when you work in private industry in the South, but if you lose or quit your job and get on relief we will fight and die for you as we are doing today because the money comes from the Treasury and not from the pockets of our precious untouchables, the private employers of the South."

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNELL] for 2½ minutes.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I was completely surprised and taken off my feet when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK] argued in behalf of this amendment. If he studies the amendment—and I do not think he has—it can only have one effect, and that effect is to drive wages in the North down to the feudal level that exists in the South. That is the only effect it can have.

You talk about your workers and that they can do as much as those in the West or in the North. You talk about their

being entitled to as much—and I think that is a true statement—but I think they are entitled to the wages that are paid in the North and in the West. I do not think you should by this amendment endeavor to destroy the wage scales that have been built up in the North by trying to drive the W. P. A. scales in the North down to the low, rotten level that you have in the South. That is the result if this amendment is agreed to. You only have so much money. You have no minimum of any kind, and in order to drive it down and have only a 10-percent differential you have to cut the wages in the North.

Mr. Chairman, I say it is a shame for the Members to get up and plead for their workers down in the South, whereas they are not pleading for them at all. You are actually trying to drive the workers in Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, New York, and the North down to the slavery that exists among the workers in the South. You ought to be ashamed to be here maintaining such an argument.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: Page 9, line 7, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That no differentials in such rates of pay shall be fixed as between different States or areas in the several States."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I transgress on the time of this House, but we have heard a great deal here today about the South and about the standards of living there until one would almost believe, if he were not familiar with that great section of the country that has contributed so much to the upbuilding of the country, that it was a foreign state instead of a part of the United States of America.

We of the South are proud of the South and of its heritage, what we stand for and what we fought for, and what we are. You only have to cross the Potomac River to step into that great State of Virginia that has done more for this country than any other 10 States north of this line. [Applause.] I am not here to raise any sectional issue. [Laughter and applause.] I am merely here to answer the sectional issue that has been raised, and attempt to place the southern W. P. A. worker on the same basis of pay with the W. P. A. worker in other sections of the country. If you will let us handle our situation in the South we shall be glad to handle it, but you want to say that some Federal officer shall come in and handle our private affairs down there. If you are going to treat us as part of the Union in one matter, treat us as part of the Union in another. [Applause.]

Briefly, the subject and the object of this amendment is not what the gentleman from Georgia has offered, a 10 percent differential, but it is to cut out differentials entirely.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman will yield to me for a moment, I should like to point out that my amendment does not require a 10-percent differential, it simply permits that much leeway in administration.

Mr. COLMER. I understand. My amendment would not permit any differential but would put the W. P. A. worker in Georgia or Mississippi upon the same basis and with the same rate of pay as the worker in New York or Connecticut or somewhere else.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I am sorry, I cannot yield.

In the next 30 days you are going to pass in this House, largely by the very votes of the gentlemen who are attacking that section of our country today, a so-called wage and hour bill. I do not yield to any man in wanting to see the wage level raised in my own section of the country, and so help me, I never was more sincere in a thing in my life than this. If I can bring myself to the conclusion that thereby we will help the wage earner in the South by the passage of the wage and hour bill, I shall be glad to vote for it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. COLMER. I am sorry, I cannot yield.

How can anybody defend the most inconsistent and most asinine proposition in the world, that of the Federal Government saying to the employers of labor in the South, "You cannot have any wage differentials, you must have a wage schedule fixed by law," and then coming along and under this bill paying a lower scale of wages?

We are told by the President of the United States and by those of you gentlemen who are most insistent upon the passage of a wage and hour bill that the object of the wage and hour bill is to raise the standard of living in the South by paying the laborer a better wage, and yet this same Democratic administration and you gentlemen who are advocating this wage and hour bill so vigorously in the same breath say that the W. P. A. wage earner in the North is entitled to \$58 per month while the W. P. A. wage earner in the South must work for as little as \$19 to \$21 per month. But this is only part of the story. The skilled worker in the North gets as high as \$94 per month while in the South the skilled worker only gets \$61 per month. Again, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] in the District of Columbia a carpenter on a W. P. A. project gets \$73.50 for working 42 hours in the month at the established prevailing wage of \$1.75 per hour, while the unskilled worker on a W. P. A. project in Georgia or Mississippi works an entire month for \$21.

Now, to you, my colleagues from the so-called North, I submit this acid test of your sincerity. You maintain that the southern wage earner is underpaid in private industry. You take the position that there should be no differential in the wages paid in the South and those paid in the North. You say that the Federal Government should prohibit the payment of less than a minimum wage and that wages should be the same over the entire country. If you are right about this, then why in the name of consistency should not the Federal Government, which is the largest employer of labor in the country today, be required to pay the same wage scale in the South that it does in the other sections of the country? If you are genuinely and sincerely interested in the southern laboring man, and for your information there are more of them on Federal public works projects today than there are in private industry, here is your opportunity to demonstrate your sincerity. What is sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander also. If those of you north of the Mason and Dixon's line are genuinely and sincerely interested in the wage earner of the South, here is your opportunity to prove it by other than lip service. If you vote against this amendment are you not subjecting yourself to the truth of the criticism that is made of you—that you are merely trying to stop your own industries from going South. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment as a substitute.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLMER) there were—ayes 44, noes 79.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Tarver amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 57, noes 78.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McREYNOLDS: On page 9, line 4, after the word "title", insert "for unskilled labor the wages shall be uniform and there shall be no differentials; and for intermediate skilled, professional, and technical employees."

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Chairman, quite a controversy has arisen between the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin and Arkansas in reference to the prevailing rate. Both are right. The gentleman from Arkansas is right when he says the unskilled-labor wage rate is based upon the standard of living, while the other rate for skilled, intermediate, and scientific workers is based upon the prevailing rate.

This amendment does not undertake to change the rate as to skilled labor but only as to unskilled labor. We in the South are perfectly willing to let you come into our manufacturing plants where we have skilled labor and pay our skilled-labor prices. We have good rates. But if you are going to pass the wage and hour bill and keep for unskilled labor the same rate the manufacturers pay for unskilled labor everywhere, then why should not the Government fix the same rate to be paid for unskilled labor throughout the United States for W. P. A.? I have said it is wrong, as there is a difference in the cost of living; but you who signed that petition say the principle is right. If it is right, then you have a chance to say so in your vote on this amendment and let us see where you stand.

In some sections of my State \$19.20 is paid to the W. P. A. worker who is not close to the city or whose county does not adjoin a city. In New York State, under the same conditions, where no cities are involved, the Labor Department has figured the difference in the standard of living, and the workers are paid \$40 a month. If it is just under the wage and hour bill to pay the same rate, then is it not just to our poor people in the South under the same conditions that they should have the same W. P. A. payments? If you will excuse the old expression, I would say, "Whatever is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander."

This amendment does not apply to skilled or technical labor but applies only to the same character of workers whom you cover in the wage and hour bill. That is the reason I am offering it. I want to see if you are fair. We insist we are entitled to a differential. We insist there is a difference in the cost of living. In that bill you say there is not. Therefore, I offer this amendment to let you express yourselves on whether or not you will be just to our people of the W. P. A. who have worked in these rural sections. [Applause.]

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, the following States of this Union, Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia, are those States that for many, many years, through good weather and bad, have stood by the Democratic Party. The population of these 11 States is approximately 29,000,000 people. I understand that for the first time in about 40 years the great State of Pennsylvania is now in the Democratic ranks and, of course, I hope it will stay there. The State of Pennsylvania has a population of 9,000,000 people.

If you will turn to page 16 of the hearings you will find that these 11 Southern States, which have stood by its party generation after generation, with a population of 29,000,000 people, last year received a total in W. P. A. funds of \$210,000,000, and the one State of Pennsylvania received \$214,000,000.

Mr. DIES. Is that actually in the record?

Mr. PACE. On pages 16 and 17 of the hearings, in the testimony of Administrator Harry Hopkins.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. In just a moment.

Every man in the State of Pennsylvania that is without work and honestly cannot secure work can be taken care of, but I say to you that I, for one, can never believe that these 11 States with their 29,000,000 people and their great cities have been treated fairly in the distribution of W. P. A. funds. [Applause.]

Can there be any foundation to the charge, which we hear so often, that political considerations play a large part? Is

the old Democratic South being punished because we are regular, while the plum is given to the doubtful State? Does anyone believe that there is more want and need among the 9,000,000 in Pennsylvania than there is among the 29,000,000 in the 11 States of the Old South?

Here are the official figures.

State	Population, 1930 census	Works Progress Administration expenditures, fiscal year 1937
Alabama	2,645,248	\$18,850,556.85
Arkansas	1,854,482	6,732,082.62
Florida	1,468,211	17,097,083.98
Georgia	2,908,506	20,607,593.85
Louisiana	2,101,593	22,118,440.62
Mississippi	2,009,821	15,516,880.88
North Carolina	3,170,276	14,620,166.46
South Carolina	1,738,765	13,761,813.28
Tennessee	2,616,556	18,845,424.43
Texas	5,824,715	39,464,816.91
Virginia	2,421,851	13,332,415.69
Total 11 States	28,761,024	210,750,000.00
Pennsylvania	9,631,350	214,565,000.00

The State of New York is also regarded as doubtful, politically, at times. It appears that New York City received \$241,215,600.98 and the balance of New York State received \$80,216,460.52, making a total for the entire State of \$321,432,061.50.

This gave the two States, Pennsylvania and New York, a total for the fiscal year 1937 of \$535,997,000. The total W. P. A. funds available was \$1,899,069,166.44, and you will see that these two States alone received almost 30 percent of the funds for the entire Nation.

They are both great States, with great industrial centers. They have problems which deserve our sympathetic consideration, but I cannot believe that the needs in these 2 States, as compared with conditions in the South, are such as to justify expenditures for New York and Pennsylvania of nearly three times the amount expended in the 11 Southern States, or \$535,000,000 for 2 and \$210,000,000 for 11.

We should all give this further study and investigation.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. BATES. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Chairman, either by accident or otherwise, we are really approaching today one of the most important questions that ever came on the floor of this House. It involves the history of the United States, it involves the economic rights of its citizens, and it involves the psychology and thought of every Member of this Chamber.

Here we have the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS] who led in the defeat of the wage and hour bill last session, demanding we put through this particular amendment of his. We have the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] who was opposed to wages and hours, asking for a 10-percent differential, and we have the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNELL] who is known for his liberality all over the world—

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. In just a moment.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman made a statement about me that is incorrect. The gentleman said I am opposed to wage and hour legislation. I have made no such announcement, and in my speech on yesterday I indicated I did favor the enactment of some legislation along that line.

LAUGHABLE, INCONSISTENT, AND FUNNY

Mr. MAVERICK. All right. I am glad the gentleman from Georgia has said he was not opposed to wage and hour legislation.

But to go on.

Then the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNELL], than whom there is no better liberal man in the world, he comes out and wants my people in the South to get lower wages.

Now, these gentlemen come to us and say we have got to keep slave wages in the South, but when you have a soldier down in Texas he gets the same as in New York. When you have a postal clerk he gets the same in the South, or when you have any Federal employee he gets the same pay in the South, and I want to tell you now that when the Federal Government establishes a standard it should be the same all over the United States. Then where do you get this stuff of giving a man less on the W. P. A. in the South than in the North?

Believe me, this is a laughable, inconsistent, a funny situation.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAVERICK. Not now.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. The gentleman made a remark about me and I ought to have a chance.

LABOR AND OTHER STANDARDS FOR THE NATION

Mr. MAVERICK. Do not take this out of my time, Mr. Chairman.

We have this situation here. People who want a differential for the South in wages or those who want to keep low wages, want high W. P. A. wages. Then those from places where they have high labor standards want us down South to have a low W. P. A. standard.

Why, this is the most ridiculous situation that ever faced the country.

There is only one situation that we in the Congress of the United States should recognize. We represent a Nation, but ever since the cotton gin, people have been kicking the South in the face and they keep on kicking us in the face. But this is a chance for you fellows who are for the minimum wages or for high wages and for high standards to come clean with the South, because if you vote against this you give the Representatives in the South a chance to vote against minimum wages, and you are not acting sensibly in doing it.

I now yield to my friend from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. The gentleman said I was for lower wages in the South. If he studies the amendment that he argued for, he will see that the only effect of that amendment would have been to drive the wages in the North down to the low wages you people are paying in the South.

Mr. MAVERICK. There is no argument in that. If you are entitled under the Federal Government to pay \$30 for a soldier in the North, you are entitled to have that in Texas, and you get it in Texas. It is nonsense to say that the Federal Government should pay more to a person in the North than it does in the South.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. Nobody from the North said that.

Mr. MAVERICK. You are for this differential.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. Nobody from the North said anything of that kind.

Mr. MAVERICK. Well, of course, we have our differences—no two people can be exactly alike. I will say that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNELL] has been a consistent supporter of the administration, and has stood manfully by Mr. Roosevelt. I might say also that the gentleman from Montana has fought consistently for civil liberties, and has a consistently good labor record.

INCONSISTENCY IS BIGNESS; WE HAVE ALL RISEN TO THE HEIGHTS

But let me sum up by saying this is indeed an inconsistent situation. They say all big men are inconsistent; only

little men are consistent. So I can say that today, nearly every man in Congress has today risen to the heights.

Get this: What we are doing is, in effect, if we do not adopt this or some other amendment equalizing W. P. A. rates over the Nation, is to say that a man's Federal common-labor rate in certain parts of the South is \$19 per month, and \$63 per month in other parts. That is no 10-percent differential. It means people in the North and West get three and a half times as much as a man in the South.

That is not remotely fair.

WHAT! PAY ONE CONGRESSMAN \$2,700 AND ANOTHER \$10,000?

If we observed the same rate for Congressmen—just another Federal activity—we would get about \$2,700 a year, and you Yankees would get the \$10,000. That surely would be unfair. A Government day laborer, a soldier, a sailor, a mail carrier, a mechanic, get equal work for equal pay in the service of our country.

And we are National Congressmen, representing a Nation. Our standards are not standards, unless there is equality. What we should do is to have certain minima, certain standards, for the whole Nation. Let all of us—North, South, East, and West—try to build up our Nation in that way. It is only fair. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, exercising the right to extend my remarks, I include herewith a statement of mine which appeared in the Washington Post of Monday, May 9, 1938, and which has further reference to the wage and hour bill and the attitude of the South.

The statement is as follows:

[From the Washington Post of May 9, 1938]

MAVERICK URGES SOUTH TO JOIN IN SOCIAL PROGRESS—RULES COMMITTEE MUST BE REVAMPED TO SERVE PARTY, SAYS MAVERICK
(By Representative MAURY MAVERICK)

It looks as though President Roosevelt's wage-hour bill will be enacted—and connected with it are political schisms and revolutions, and whether the South will master the Democratic Party or go down the line with the other Democrats of the country.

Last session the bill was defeated with solid opposition of nearly every Southern Representative, plus conservative Democrats and Republicans. This time the bill was petitioned out as if by magic, contributing factors being resentment of the high-handedness of the Rules Committee, resentment against the National Chamber of Commerce for its impudent demand for repeal of the National Labor Relations Act, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER's renomination in Florida, and the fact that the rival labor leaders, John L. Lewis and William Green, were fighting together for the wage-hour bill, instead of against each other.

ATTACKS RULES GROUP

But that is not the story. The story is the Rules Committee, whose overwhelming majority is southern Democrat and Republican, and which fought stubbornly against the wage-hour bill. It is supposed to be the party committee to bring out party bills pledged by platform and agreed on by leaders. However, the committee prevented this pledged and oft-promised bill from going to the floor for a vote, and because this committee has become the high censor and ruler of the party resentment has increased, and the first chance the House had to repudiate them, it did.

The composition of the Democratic Party has always been a quilt patched with many colors. Far western Townsendsites, middle western agricos, big-city (including Tammany) liberals and progressives from here and there, and the South.

And the South, from where I come, pays the lowest wages, has the worst housing, and the lowest standard of living in America. The people of the South know it, and every time they have had a chance they have demanded better—they did it in Alabama in the election of Senator LISTER HILL, and then in Florida with Senator PEPPER.

CITES TECHNICALITIES

All of which is strange when one considers it is the southern delegations which have killed any legislation like that. The last wage-hour bill was rather weak, and they defeated it; now comes a more drastic one, which will no doubt pass.

Two questions are now brought to a head. One is technical, and the other of national social importance. The one is the high-handed behavior of the Rules Committee. The public cannot understand these technicalities; all it wants to know is whether the Democrats deliver the goods or not.

And unless Democratic leadership and the party get a system, including rules, where its pledges are fulfilled, it will be repudiated, as it should be.

The other point is the South. The South is for the good old-time virtues, but is not averse to taking a few billions of gold from the Federal till for the T. V. A., for cotton subsidies, W. P. A., and others.

WARNS OF RECALCITRANCE

As a southern Congressman, I have not fought very bitterly appropriations for my district. But when a general bill is offered, the South is liable to pull Thomas Jefferson from the grave and swear it's coddling the people.

As a Congressman from the South—I speak alone for myself—I believe that if we pass out subsidies for cotton-plantation owners and ranchmen and rice growers and all the rest that labor should have some protection too. And the South is not entitled to any special favors.

Not alone on this wages bill but on other legislation hinges the question whether the South goes along with the rest of the Nation. If it does not, a combination of other factors may isolate it, and laws may be forced down its throat, and knowing Americans as I do, I know my Texas and every part of the Union can get a fair deal if we are fair ourselves.

As for me, I am for throwing in with the Yankees and the liberals, the agricultural boys of the West—and the big-city Democrats, too. That is the only way the Democratic Party can do a good job and serve America.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, this discussion this afternoon is quite interesting to me, appreciating as I do the tremendous relief burden that some of the States, the great industrial States of the country, are bearing today, especially the State of Massachusetts from which I come. For many years the industries in that State and in other States of the Union have been going down and down until today those States are faced with a very critical situation. As an illustration, in the communities of my State alone, we expended through local relief last year over \$22,000,000 to feed the people who were unemployed, and who were not able to get on W. P. A. When I listen to the argument of some of the Members with respect to what is being done for them in the various States of the Union, particularly the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], who seems to complain about the way his State is being neglected by the administration of which he so proudly boasts, I am impelled to call the attention of Members of the House to what I believe to be a very discriminating situation, because, after all, those States which have been hard hit by the depressed condition of industry are having great difficulty in financing their relief problems.

As I said at the outset, in the State of Massachusetts we spent \$22,000,000 last year just to feed people who could not get on W. P. A. In the State of Georgia, in 1937, only \$34,000,000 was collected through all of the internal revenue collections, and that State got \$15,000,000 in return on relief alone.

The State expended only \$981,000 for relief outside of what it received from the Federal Government, which amount is equaled by some of our communities, our cities, alone to take care of the people. In other words, the administration at Washington favors the Democratic States of the South, it is very apparent from the tables I here submit, which I have received from the Works Progress Administration and Bureau of Internal Revenue, that many of these States are being especially favored with the Federal funds for relief work.

The table on internal-revenue collections shows the source from which these funds are collected, and it is perfectly clear from the same that the States about which the gentleman speaks are being shown extreme favoritism by the Democratic administration here in Washington. Certainly he has no just cause for complaint, and neither has any other Representative coming from those favored States, which obviously shows that they are not doing their full part in contributing toward the cost of relief for those in their communities who are unemployed.

The administration at Washington ought to see to it that all of the States of the Union which are receiving substantial grants of Federal money should cooperate and contribute in a substantial degree to this great unemployment situation.

The table I submit clearly shows they are not doing that today:

Comparison of total Federal relief (W. P. A.) and local direct relief expenditures and internal-revenue collections for calendar year 1937

States (48 and District of Columbia)	Federal funds used on W. P. A. projects ¹	State and local funds used for general and emergency relief programs of State and local relief agencies (direct relief) ¹	Ratio of State and local general relief expenditures to Federal W. P. A. expenditures (percent)	Internal-revenue collections (all sources) ²
United States..	\$1,505,593,000	\$469,080,000	31.2	\$5,617,088,564.13
Alabama.....	13,979,000	212,000	1.5	14,782,564.43
Arizona.....	5,708,000	1,136,000	19.9	4,070,586.48
Arkansas.....	12,985,000	544,000	4.2	8,024,119.68
California.....	84,815,000	34,840,000	41.1	310,944,662.73
Colorado.....	16,088,000	2,362,000	14.7	29,117,660.97
Connecticut.....	15,953,000	5,772,000	36.2	92,693,582.09
Delaware.....	1,461,000	351,000	24.0	80,381,182.18
District of Columbia.....	7,331,000	1,154,000	15.7	42,943,421.95
Florida.....	15,028,000	580,000	3.9	34,122,548.04
Georgia.....	15,987,000	981,000	6.1	4,054,203.20
Idaho.....	4,643,000	671,000	14.5	511,032,173.88
Illinois.....	107,590,000	49,012,000	45.6	112,928,527.19
Indiana.....	43,277,000	6,179,000	14.3	23,179,629.19
Iowa.....	14,937,000	7,742,000	51.8	24,179,087.56
Kansas.....	21,284,000	4,298,000	20.2	120,439,554.72
Kentucky.....	23,302,000	661,000	2.8	40,679,182.10
Louisiana.....	18,759,000	1,481,000	7.9	14,208,357.29
Maine.....	4,220,000	3,255,000	77.1	141,727,872.98
Maryland.....	8,679,000	2,200,000	25.3	190,485,558.42
Massachusetts.....	73,805,000	22,540,000	30.5	340,850,865.79
Michigan.....	44,576,000	17,214,000	38.6	67,660,371.57
Minnesota.....	34,810,000	13,733,000	39.5	6,186,038.57
Mississippi.....	12,099,000	46,000	.4	133,107,995.63
Missouri.....	43,373,000	6,270,000	14.5	6,270,217.39
Montana.....	9,094,000	895,000	9.8	20,414,083.87
Nebraska.....	14,397,000	1,447,000	10.1	4,775,135.85
Nevada.....	1,500,000	198,000	13.2	9,624,131.24
New Hampshire.....	4,812,000	2,381,000	49.5	218,574,991.36
New Jersey.....	64,046,000	17,126,000	26.7	2,558,230.66
New Mexico.....	6,205,000	328,000	5.3	1,220,651,352.31
New York.....	254,281,000	140,088,000	55.1	324,756,911.93
North Carolina.....	12,003,000	705,000	5.9	1,658,487.82
North Dakota.....	9,488,000	2,183,000	23.0	328,300,864.94
Ohio.....	91,495,000	20,391,000	22.3	58,266,063.96
Oklahoma.....	24,546,000	2,063,000	8.4	14,973,546.31
Oregon.....	11,515,000	2,350,000	20.4	473,630,189.00
Pennsylvania.....	172,223,000	63,154,000	36.7	30,014,093.63
Rhode Island.....	8,118,000	3,437,000	42.3	11,086,434.05
South Carolina.....	10,838,000	99,000	.9	2,073,554.28
South Dakota.....	11,060,000	1,071,000	9.7	30,642,440.05
Tennessee.....	13,301,000	1,067,000	8.0	127,113,183.77
Texas.....	33,202,000	1,313,000	4.0	7,149,589.99
Utah.....	6,466,000	1,441,000	22.3	4,514,750.03
Vermont.....	2,176,000	872,000	40.1	163,908,169.75
Virginia.....	10,985,000	1,050,000	9.6	37,308,596.16
Washington.....	21,815,000	7,471,000	34.2	23,394,080.63
West Virginia.....	21,942,000	2,859,000	13.0	99,307,475.85
Wisconsin.....	36,011,000	11,558,000	32.1	3,060,240.21
Wyoming.....	2,054,000	299,000	14.6	
Undistributed.....	7,410,000			

¹Source: Works Progress Administration.

²Source: Treasury Department, Bureau of Internal Revenue; includes pay roll and agricultural adjustment taxes; total for United States includes receipts from Territories.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, now that we have recalled the grandeur of the North and the West and the East, and have adequately expounded the glories of the Old South, now that we have settled the momentous problem of the wage-hour bill, reaching conclusions satisfactory to our several selves, I hope we will remember that today we have a relief bill under consideration, a bill that has been laid out according to a well-defined program, a smoothly working program, which we feel adequately meets the situation, a bill that is built upon a certain philosophy of relief, and I hope that we will remember that to interfere with it by undertaking to freeze into permanent law provisions such as are suggested in this amendment and in other similar amendments which have been defeated would certainly be unwise and would interfere with the program and prevent people from having work whom Congress wants to have work. If it succeeded in raising some particular man's relief, it might be the cause of throwing other men out of work and preventing them from getting jobs that we are trying to provide. I hope from now on that we will

have a moratorium on the wage and hour matter until such time as we can take it up in this Chamber in regular order, and reach some conclusion, if there is a conclusion that can be reached. I certainly hope that this amendment will be rejected, and that no other such amendment will be adopted or grafted upon this relief bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McREYNOLDS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McREYNOLDS) there were—ayes 50, noes 105.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. As many as favor taking the vote by tellers will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Nineteen Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and tellers are refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. In the employment of persons on projects under the appropriations in this title, applicants in actual need whose names have not heretofore been placed on relief rolls shall be given the same eligibility for employment as applicants whose names have heretofore appeared on such rolls: *Provided*, That in order to insure the fulfillment of the purposes for which such appropriations are made and to avoid competition between the Works Progress Administration and other Federal or non-Federal agencies in the employment of labor on construction projects of any nature whatsoever, financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government, no relief worker shall be eligible for employment on any project of the Works Progress Administration who has refused to accept employment on any other Federal or non-Federal project at a wage rate comparable with or higher than the wage rate established for similar work on projects of the Works Progress Administration: *Provided further*, That any relief worker who has been engaged on any Federal or non-Federal project and whose service has been regularly terminated through no fault of his own shall not lose his eligibility for restoration to the relief rolls or for reemployment on any other Federal or non-Federal project on account of such previous employment: *Provided further*, That the fact that a person is entitled to or has received either adjusted-service bonds or a Treasury check in payment of an adjusted-compensation certificate shall not be considered in determining actual need of such employment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: Page 10, line 10, after the period insert: "Farmers in need of work but who are not on relief rolls shall have the same eligibility for employment on projects in rural areas as persons on such rolls."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is that the amendment makes eligible for work relief people who are not on relief. The bill is designed to afford work and work relief to needy persons, yet this amendment undertakes to make eligible a class of persons who do not come within that classification.

Mr. JONES. If the Chair is in doubt I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman from Texas on the point of order.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph by its very terms includes persons not on relief. It starts out with that proposition, for it says:

In the employment of persons on projects under the appropriations in this title applicants in actual need whose names have not heretofore been placed on relief rolls shall have the same eligibility—

And so forth. In other words, Mr. Chairman, while the primary purpose of this bill may be to take care of those on relief rolls, but by the very terms of this paragraph, and that is the only excuse for the language in it, it makes eligible for work, under the terms of this bill, other people than those on relief rolls. It reads: "Those in actual need." I say that farmers in need of work certainly present a form of need.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. People might be in need of work who are absolutely not in need of public assistance. The purpose of this paragraph, if the Chair will read it, is to take care of persons in actual need, not of work but in actual need of public assistance. The gentleman's amendment reads, "in need of work." Many people may be in need of work who are not in actual need of public assistance.

Mr. JONES. May I ask the gentleman if need of work is not actual need? To say it is not is to be both hypercritical and supertechnical. The idea of a man saying that if a man is in actual need he is entitled to go on these rolls, yet if he is in actual need of work that that is not need—I cannot conceive the logic, or the sense, or the justice of any such interpretation as that.

Again I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the last proviso of section 10 exempts from all questions of doubt those who have drawn adjusted-service certificates. That goes far beyond the limit to which I am going. In other words, if a man has drawn a service certificate of \$1,000, he is entitled to the benefit of this provision, regardless of whether he qualifies under the term "actual need"; and by what process of reasoning can the gentleman from Virginia or the Chair reach the conclusion that need of work is not actual need? By what twisting of the English language can you reach a conclusion that is at all logical that one form of need is actual but another form of need is not actual?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Last year we had 12,000,000 unemployed men. The purpose of this bill is to relieve them. They are unemployed because they have not got work. The farmer is unemployed because he has not got work, and he has got to work in order to eat.

Mr. JONES. If need of work is not actual need, what sort of need is it? And what right has the gentleman to construe what form of need is actual need?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McCORMACK). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The section under consideration relates to applicants in actual need. The gentleman from Texas, in answer to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Virginia, lays emphasis upon the proviso which is found on page 10, line 6, a part of section 10 relating to veterans, and I quote the language:

The fact that a person is entitled to or has received either adjusted-service bonds or a Treasury check in payment of an adjusted-compensation certificate shall not be considered in determining actual need of such employment.

While this is an exception, it is not a qualification, in the opinion of the Chair, of the requirement of actual need. The fact remains that a veteran must still be in actual need before he or she is eligible to assignment to a W. P. A. project.

The language of the gentleman's amendment confines itself to need. The Chair is frank to state that this, in the Chair's mind, is a very close question.

It does not come within the purview of the Chair to interpret "need" or "actual need." Recognizing it as a very close question, however, the Chair feels that the amendment is not germane to the provisions of section 10 which requires that an applicant to be eligible for consideration and for assignment to a project must be in actual need.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I will modify the amendment to insert the word "actual" before the word "need." Would that remedy the situation?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not passing upon that at the present time. If the gentleman presents that amendment, the Chair will then determine the question.

For the reasons stated, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment with the word "actual" before the word "need."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: Page 10, line 10, after the period, insert "Farmers in actual need of work but who are not on relief rolls shall have the same eligibility for employment on projects in rural areas as persons on such rolls."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, as I caught the reading of the amendment, it is the same as the other one.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Virginia that this amendment is different. The Chair is not indicating what may be his ruling if a point of order is raised. For the information of the gentleman from Virginia, the present amendment reads "farmers in actual need." The previous amendment, to which the Chair sustained the point of order, read "farmers in need."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to permit farmers who are in actual need of work to work on projects in rural areas, regardless of whether they are technically on the relief rolls or not. Any of you who represent country districts have had the experience over and over again of farmers who have their teams mortgaged, their equipment and livestock mortgaged, in some instances for the full worth, and yet these farmers cannot technically qualify and they cannot technically meet the rules and regulations set out on projects in the rural areas.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman from Texas indicate what the definition of "farmer" is?

Mr. JONES. That is a pretty well understood term.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Would it include, for instance, the son of the owner of the farm?

Mr. JONES. I take it that same question arises in any form of relief. I am not qualified to pass on the administrative features; but if it includes the son of a farmer, and he can qualify, I suppose he would be on the same basis as the son of a merchant, the son of a laborer, or anyone else. I take it that question arises regardless of this particular issue.

The fact that they cannot qualify technically, and in many instances administrative officials do not have the facilities to go out and collect these people, causes them to sink when they would be able to pull out if you would give them the opportunity to work on these projects. It does not take much money. It would not require many dollars perhaps to enable them to pull through. If you had gone through these country areas as I have, and if you had had farmers say to you that the little loan made them or the little provisions in the Triple A kept them off relief, and see the sparkle that came into their eyes when they made the statement, you would realize that that spirit is worth preserving in America.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that under the language of the section, without the amendment, the farmer would be eligible anyway.

Mr. JONES. I do not think so. I have had many instances come to my attention of farmers, especially in the drought areas, who practically have nothing, yet they do have a team, they have some machinery, and in some instances farms. They are asked the question if they have property and they cannot qualify. Of course, they can by surrendering all of it and turning the machinery back to the company, deserting and going to the cities and towns, thereby complicating the problem existing there. Why in the name of good common sense should we not permit them to work?

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to my colleague from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. If inferentially they are included in this section, then there is no reason why it should not be made clear by the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. JONES. That is true, and I do not see why the gentleman from Virginia should object.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman talked about the adaptability of the son of a farmer and the son of a merchant. I wonder if the provision would be extended to include the "son of a gun."

Mr. JONES. On that question I am willing to defer to anyone who has studied the subject. Of course, my friend is facetious.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Is it not a fact that the regulations prevent any farmer, even though he is in distress, from becoming eligible for W. P. A. work?

Mr. JONES. I know in many instances that is true. I have heard the complaint from all sides. I do not believe there is a Member in this House from a country district who has not had this complaint come to him.

Mr. HAINES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. According to the language of the gentleman's amendment, it would exclude farmers from working in cities and towns?

Mr. JONES. No; I do not think so. This is an enabling amendment. If a farmer is on relief he would be entitled to come within the general terms of the bill. This will also enable farmers of the other type to come within the provisions of the bill.

I want to say that, in my judgment, this amendment will help the problem in the cities. With just a little work many farmers will remain on the farm. Otherwise, if they are forced to the wall, they might have no choice but to go to the cities, where the living expense would be greater. They want to remain on the farm. Why not permit them to do so?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

With the justification that the word "wages" is used in this section, I would insert in the Record just one statement with a comment, and not take my 5 minutes. Simply that the House may realize what it is doing in this matter of wages, I may say yesterday's paper announced that the housing atrocity known as Greenbelt, in the suburbs of Washington, has cost \$14,227,000, and this cost was \$4,902,000 more than it would have been save for the employment of relief labor. One-third of this cost and more was due to the necessity of paying relief labor wages according to the contemplation of this bill. It may or may not be wise to dispense charity in that fashion, but it is almighty hard on the taxpayer.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Has the gentleman had occasion to visit Greenbelt?

Mr. LUCE. I have visited it twice.

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman conceive of there being anywhere in the world more of a wholesale experiment in socialism, or, I might say, communism, than is found in that particular project?

Mr. LUCE. I cannot.

Mr. COX. Could the Government recoup one cent on the dollar on the expenditures made out there?

Mr. LUCE. I very much doubt it. I came back the second time with a strengthened belief that this was the most absurd, preposterous, and outrageous thing the Government of the United States ever did.

Mr. COX. And a disgrace to the Nation.

Mr. LUCE. A disgrace to the Nation.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLER to the amendment offered by Mr. JONES: After the word "farmers", insert "and all other persons."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McCORMACK). The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 93, noes 32.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. KELLER. For a question, yes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is it not a fact that the gentleman's 5 minutes is not taken out of the 15 minutes, because the gentleman had already gained the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the 5 minutes of the gentleman from Illinois are included in the 15 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. There were six or seven Members standing at the time the debate was closed. Is it in order to allow one man 5 minutes when six or seven Members were demanding recognition?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not recognize that as a proper subject of a point of order, but the Chair feels the gentleman's suggestion is a proper one. The Chair had recognized the gentleman from Illinois for 5 minutes; otherwise the Chair would have undertaken to meet the situation as indicated by the gentleman. The Chair understands 10 Members are seeking recognition. If the gentleman from Illinois does not consume the full 5 minutes, the remainder of his time will be available for the benefit of the other Members. If there is no objection, the Chair will recognize for 1 minute other Members seeking recognition. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty accord with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas as amended by myself. Of course, every farmer in need of work has a right to work, and so has every other man and woman in America exactly the same right.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The home owners who are in distress and cannot pay their mortgages or taxes should also get relief.

Mr. KELLER. Why, of course. That is what I am trying to say. The gentleman has opened the door wide to what I tried to say a couple of hours ago, that we are drifting constantly nearer and nearer to the acceptance by this body, and by the American people, of the right of a job for every man and woman who wants to work. We are going to adopt that policy. Whether we accept it today or another day is not material.

Of course, if you vote for the farmer you certainly cannot afford to turn down the fellow who is not a farmer. I am a farmer, among the rest. I am for giving the farmer his job; I am for giving the coal miner a job; I am for giving jobs to the white-collared men and women; I am for giving work to every home owner in America who needs work; I am for giving a job and good pay to every man or woman who needs a job.

This is what we are going to do, but we ought not to make fish of one and flesh of another. I therefore hope that if you are going to vote for the principle in the Jones amendment you will also vote for the Keller amendment to the Jones

amendment and declare for the right of every man and woman in America to a job.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I expect the next move will be an amendment to require a man to be a millionaire before he can get relief.

Mr. KELLER. That would be nice, would it not? But I am afraid it would not provide relief for any large number of the unwillingly idle. I have no objection to millionaires if they are fair and square and earn their wealth through service rendered. I believe in making wealth; vastly more than we are making now, and giving everybody a chance at it.

Idleness is the most expensive thing in the world. We are poor only because we are idle.

We have lost since 1930 through idleness in this country nearly \$80,000,000,000 through loss to wage earners alone, and we do not seem to understand where we are going. That is 10 times what we have been willing to spend in providing jobs. What is the sense in such a policy?

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. VOORHIS. I believe if we take the 1929 production figures and figure how much less than that has been produced since that year, the loss is close to \$250,000,000,000, and I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that that is a great deal more of a national disgrace than any attempt to build some additional houses for somebody to live in?

Mr. KELLER. Of course, it is. The disgrace of the thing is that we are poor because we have permitted ourselves to remain idle. The only reason we are poor is because we are not using our manhood and womanhood to create wealth. The only way we can do that is to create jobs, and that is the reason I am for the gentleman's amendment as amended by my amendment, to make universal employment a part of the American program. I am for universal employment, and we can have it. Other countries are doing it, and so can we. We will be wise when we do it.

I am speaking of only industrial figures, that is, only the figures taken up and collated by the Department of Labor, which show a loss of nearly \$80,000,000,000 in wages in industry alone.

Then I point out again, as I have done before, that just in proportion as the wages of industry go up the incomes of the farmers go up. They go up together and go down together, and they go along together. When labor is well employed the farmers are well employed also, and, on the other hand, when farmers are receiving proper income labor is also receiving a proper income. They either sink together or swim together. The idea that the man in the city and the man in the country are not in the same boat economically is nonsense. It is just plain, arrant nonsense. Your white-collar man in New York and your farmer in Illinois are tied just as closely as my two fingers, and each depends on the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KELLER) there were—ayes 25, noes 64.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 105, noes 46.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of Ohio: Section 10, page 10, line 10, insert: "Provided further, That any person employed on a project under this appropriation who is unavoidably absent from work because of illness, as certified by a licensed physician, shall

LXXXIII—429

be given the right to make up the time lost by reason of such illness, through an assignment of an equivalent number of hours of work in addition to the regular monthly schedule of hours then in effect; provided that such person shall be required to make up lost time within a reasonable period, and that the amount of leave because of sickness shall not be more than 60 days in any one calendar year; and provided further, that no persons shall forfeit eligibility to relief by reason of such illness."

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the gag just imposed denies an opportunity to adequately explain this amendment before it is acted upon, and I have no choice but to resort to extension of these remarks to establish a clear understanding of it.

This amendment corrects a terrible injustice. It affects thousands of unfortunate people in every State and district. It does not deal with new fields of activity—the objection offered to many proposals here this afternoon. It is confined to the question of fairness in relief operations.

When a man or woman becomes sick under present relief regulations, the pay stops the minute he cannot report for work. If a person is out of a job and cannot find one, that is bad enough; but if, on top of that, he or she is stricken ill, certainly that is a whole lot worse. The person who must depend upon relief for an income needs assistance twice as much when sickness adds to his troubles and burdens. His family has to eat just the same, and he must have medical treatment; and yet, under present regulations, the only wages he receives are shut off.

Under this amendment a person on the relief rolls who is stricken by real illness would have an opportunity to make up that lost time and restore that lost income. He or she would be given an assignment of an equivalent number of hours of work in addition to the regular monthly schedule then in effect, and would receive pay accordingly. Upon the completion of this process the individual would have the same number of hours of both work and pay that he would receive if the illness had not occurred. Is not that plain justice?

At the present time eligibility is also lost under these circumstances and recertification becomes necessary. Also, under the amendment, such forfeit will be eliminated.

By voting for this amendment you are saying to the jobless man or woman that they will not be penalized by a condition of illness they cannot help; that you are not going to refuse them the opportunity to restore their regular pay and the necessities which it affords, at a time when tough luck has hit them an extra blow.

Furthermore, the amendment is safeguarded against any possibility of playing sick, or attempted chiseling. A doctor's certificate must be furnished. If the person fails to make up the lost time by extra work, he fails to restore the lost pay. The cheater cannot cheat, and it saves those who are willing to perform this work from being cheated. In the name of fairness and humane treatment I believe this amendment should be adopted.

Mr. COX. This amendment would take care of the drunks, too, would it not?

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Absolutely not. I shall try to appreciate the gentleman's attempt at humor, but in view of the safeguards, his inference is both ridiculous and an insult to the members of the medical profession.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, this is an attempt to write into this bill rules and regulations with respect to relief. It is impossible to do that with respect to this bill unless you want to sit here and write all the rules and regulations with respect to the various methods of employment. I hope the committee will not start doing that with respect to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE of Ohio) there were—ayes 46, noes 81.

Mr. WHITE of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers. Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 10, line 10, after the word "employment", insert: "Provided further, That in the payment, application, or distribution of the funds appropriated or authorized by this act, no discrimination shall be made because of membership or nonmembership in any union or organization."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is not germane to this section. Section 19 deals with that subject matter.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on that particular subject?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the subject?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from New York briefly.

Mr. TABER. Section 10 covers terms of employment. It covers persons who are eligible, and a great many who are not. This amendment is clearly germane, to provide in this section that no requirements shall be made as qualification for employment. Section 19 is just a penalty section. This is an affirmative section and provides for a great many different types of employment. It provides certain reasons why certain requirements should not be raised, just like the proposition that the gentleman from Texas presented. There can be no question but that it is clearly in order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, may I say just a word? If this amendment were to be offered to section 19 it would not be germane, because section 19 does not deal with determining the eligibility, but deals with the act of administrators or others in trying to prevent certain employment. This section does deal strictly with the question of eligibility. Therefore, it must be germane here, because it could not be germane to section 19.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. Section 10 relates to the employment of persons on projects under appropriations in this title and provides that applicants in actual need, and so forth, and goes on and covers in a broad way the applicants who are eligible for employment by W. P. A. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has called to the attention of the Chair the provisions of section 19, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has called to the attention of the Chair that section 19 is of a penalty nature. The Chair is constrained to agree with the gentleman from New York. The amendment of the gentleman from Michigan has no relation as the Chair sees it to the penalty provisions of section 19, and, if germane, would have to have some relationship to the employment of persons on projects under the appropriations in this title as contained in section 10. The amendment of the gentleman from Michigan reads:

In the payment, application, or distribution of the funds appropriated or authorized by this act, no discrimination shall be made because of membership or nonmembership in any union or organization.

In the opinion of the Chair that is a direction to the Works Progress Administrator in relation to the appointment of persons on projects under the appropriations in this title. The Chair feels that the amendment is germane, and for the reasons stated the Chair overrules the point of order. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 1 minute.

PROTECT THE W. P. A. WORKER

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries an appropriation of more than \$3,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money to be spent at the discretion of the President.

The purpose of the bill, we are told, is to bring about recovery. That purpose is to be accomplished mainly by giving employment to those who are out of work.

Many friends of the administration admit that a large part of the money heretofore appropriated for this same

purpose has been used extravagantly, has been wasted, has been spent on useless projects.

It has been charged not only by Republicans but by Democrats in high positions as, for example, in the State of Pennsylvania, that funds heretofore appropriated for relief purposes have been used for political purposes. It is evident that politics has been played with human misery through the expenditure of relief funds.

Every man in this House is willing, and the country demands, that we appropriate out of any moneys which we have or can borrow sufficient to prevent suffering by the unemployed. Equally true is it that the people as a whole do not approve of and we should not appropriate one dollar to be used for political purposes or to further the ambition of any individual.

To aid in preventing the diversion, for the benefit of labor racketeers, of any part of the money which will be appropriated by this House under the terms of this bill, I have offered an amendment which reads:

Provided further, That in the payment, application, or distribution of any of the funds appropriated or authorized by this act, no discrimination shall be made because of membership or nonmembership in any union or organization.

In the April 30, 1938, Flint edition of the newspaper, United Automobile Worker, member of the Committee for Industrial Organization, purporting to be published at Detroit, in a box on the front page you will find this notice:

W. P. A. DUES

Any man working on W. P. A. is not entitled to unemployment receipts unless he joins the W. P. A. Auxiliary, and pays the regular dues, 50 cents each month, or pays his regular union fee of \$1.

I have been informed by a member of the U. A. W. A. that "unemployment receipt" means the receipt ordinarily issued by a union on the payment of dues by a member, on which there has been stamped a notation showing that the member is out of employment, and that a union member possessing such a receipt so stamped is excused from paying his regular dues because he is unemployed.

The statement in the United Automobile Worker is captioned "W. P. A. Dues," and it means, as I construe it, that no member of a union employed on W. P. A. will be excused from paying his regular union dues, even though he is unemployed, "unless he joins the W. P. A. auxiliary, and pays the regular dues, 50 cents each month, or pays his regular union fee of \$1."

Under this procedure, every member of a union desiring to secure the benefits of W. P. A. employment is required to join the W. P. A. auxiliary; in other words, a union of W. P. A. workers, and he is required to pay the regular W. P. A. auxiliary dues of 50 cents a month, or pay his regular union fee of \$1.

Here we are, the whole country suffering from one of the most severe depressions in our history, taking money, either by direct or indirect taxation, from farmer, small-business man, all those who are working; from all those who are living upon what they may have been able to save during the period of their industrial activity; from everyone who eats, drinks, smokes or wears clothing; setting it apart into a separate fund, a fund which should be sacred to the purpose for which it is appropriated, that is, for the relief of suffering by the giving of made work, and, if you vote down this amendment, you refuse to say that that fund shall not be used to enrich the racketeers who would profit from the misfortune of those who are out of employment, the W. P. A. workers.

As well might an organizer or an organization demand from the beneficiaries of Red Cross funds a share of that money so charitably given.

I know of no reason why we should appropriate from a fund taken from the taxpayer's money for the purpose of giving jobs to the unemployed and then permit a labor organization, or any other organization or any individual, to exact a portion of the money so appropriated for the purpose of enriching the organization or the organizer individually.

I hope the gentleman from Virginia will accept this amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER. If the gentleman will permit, what is the W. P. A. Auxiliary?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not know of my own knowledge what the W. P. A. Auxiliary is, except that it is some union organization. I am advised that the W. P. A. Auxiliary is a union of W. P. A. workers and that its activities have been sanctioned, or at least not disapproved of by high State officials and men in the employ of the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOODRUM. A similar motion has been acted on by the House.

Mr. TABER. I call the Chair's attention to the fact that since that motion was acted upon business has intervened.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia, in view of the fact that an amendment has been adopted since the motion was acted upon, press his point of order?

Mr. WOODRUM. I do; and I base the point of order upon the further ground that it is a dilatory motion. This is perfectly obvious.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman bases his point of order on the ground that it is a dilatory motion?

Mr. WOODRUM. I base it upon that ground and upon the further ground that a similar motion has been acted upon by the Committee and time for debate on this amendment has been fixed.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. McCormack). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The point of order is based upon the ground that a similar motion has previously been acted on. The Chair feels this ground not sound and overrules that point of order.

So far as the question of dilatoriness is concerned, the Chair has not had sufficient evidence as yet to determine that the gentleman from Michigan is dilatory and offers his motion for the purpose of delay. This being a question of fact the Chair is unable to determine it against the gentleman from Michigan; and for this reason the second ground for the point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not use the 5 minutes permitted under the rule.

One other reason why I cannot vote for this bill is because not only in Michigan but in other parts of the country money which we appropriate for relief is not only used for political purposes but a portion of it is, by certain organizations, forced from those who want to work on W. P. A. jobs.

Harry Hopkins says, other spokesmen for the administration say that it is unthinkable that the funds which we appropriate for relief should be taken from those who earn them on made work. Nevertheless, that very thing is being done. W. P. A. money is being diverted from the worker's pocket to the pocket of the racketeer. It is to prevent that practice that this amendment is offered, and yet I anticipate that you will vote it down.

We of the House render lip service to high ideals, but by our acts we leave the door open for the slimy hand of the parasite so that he may pick the pocket of the unfortunate.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. In my city of St. Louis they are charging 50 cents a month for C. I. O. dues against relief workers.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am sure we do not want to appropriate money and then have the men who want jobs held up and made to pay tribute to an organizer before they can go to work.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I care to say. Vote this amendment down if you wish but do not say you were not warned. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. BOILEAU. Does the gentleman know that the C. I. O. and the Workers' Alliance have been advocating exactly the same kind of amendment the gentleman from Michigan has offered?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand the gentleman from Michigan offering anything advocated by C. I. O. or Workers' Alliance. I do not believe that any person should be asked to contribute money to any organization as a condition precedent to obtaining work on the W. P. A.; but I do not believe that the gentleman from Michigan can charge the W. P. A. officials with any such action. The W. P. A. officials are not subject to the dictates of the C. I. O., and they are not subject to the dictates of the American Federation of Labor, or any other organization. I cannot understand the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] whose speeches on the floor of this House can be recognized in the record without even reading them because practically every other word is "C. I. O." He is enemy No. 1 of the C. I. O. and any labor organization.

He is now trying to lead you to believe that he is offering an amendment to protect members of C. I. O. and other labor organizations. I am suspicious that such is not the case. I believe it is nothing more or less than an attempt to blacken the name of the officials of the Works Progress Administration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is inaccurate in that statement. I made no attack on the W. P. A.

Mr. HOOK. The gentleman's actions are enough.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Absolutely not. I am talking today about these agents collecting dues.

Mr. HOOK. The gentleman's actions are enough, the innuendo which is left and the reason back of it is enough to convince me as to the reasons for offering it. I think I know what is behind it.

I think this is an amendment that probably should be adopted. If it were presented by a man who was sincere in an effort to protect labor organization members, I would vote for it, but I am constrained to vote against it under the circumstances, because I fear that the members of labor organizations are being put on the spot.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Does the gentleman know the fact that the C. I. O. collects 50 cents a month from W. P. A. workers in St. Louis, that this fact was reported to officials of the W. P. A., but they refused to take any action?

Mr. HOOK. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. I may state for the gentleman's information that that is a fact.

Mr. HOOK. If W. P. A. officials in the gentleman's city condone such actions, they ought to be removed even if they had to be removed by the Pendergast machine.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Does the gentleman see any objection to a W. P. A. worker joining a labor organization if he so desires, and paying dues? I cannot see anything wrong about that. Why has he not the same right as any other worker?

I see no objection to W. P. A. workers belonging to any organization of their choosing.

Mr. HOOK. If he joins voluntarily that is his own business. No one should interfere or be allowed to interfere along those lines.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer an amendment very shortly, however, that, in my opinion, will eliminate the snooping case workers going down to unfortunates' homes to determine what is in a man's pantry before he will be given a chance for work on the W. P. A. It is a disgrace the way these E. R. A. officials act in my State. It will eliminate the E. R. A. and make the W. P. A. the certifying agency. I think the amendment I propose to offer should be adopted. However, with this gag rule of allowing only 1 minute to explain, I am fearful. I will, however, do my duty to my people and place it before you for a vote. I take this opportunity because of the limited time left for discussion of amendments to this section.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WARREN). The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BOILEAU), there were—ayes 39, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to make an inquiry of the chairman of the subcommittee. As I understand it, heretofore the rule has been that if a man is employed on W. P. A. and he leaves the W. P. A. voluntarily to get a few days' work, he cannot get back on. He has lost his place. This is not right. It would help some other man to get on while that first fellow was off. Is it the purpose of the language at the bottom of the page, line 25, to correct the situation so that if a man does leave the W. P. A. without any fault of his own to get a few days' work some place else, that he can get back on the W. P. A. when he has finished that work?

Mr. WOODRUM. That is correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOOK: Page 9, line 13, after the colon and following the word "rolls" insert "Provided, however, That the Works Progress Administration is hereby designated as the certifying agency."

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment that will do away with your snooping social workers who, without any invitation, walk into people's homes, go through the house from cellar to roof, from pantry to bedroom, and lecture the housewife and insult the husband before they will make a report as to whether or not a man is entitled to work for his daily bread. I do not know what the condition is in the rest of the States, but in the State of Michigan it is an absolute disgrace. The Michigan congressional delegation, including our Senator, decided yesterday that this amendment should be adopted. It is my thought that if the W. P. A. officials were given the authority to determine the actual need, without being browbeaten by these snooping social workers, we will be far better off and the people who are actually in need of work would receive it on a basis that is fair and just. For God's sake, how long must we put up with the E. R. A.

You have provided in this bill that any person who leaves W. P. A. for private employment and then loses his job, will, if he needs work, be immediately employed on W. P. A. That reads nice on paper, but it does not work out that

way. He must now be recertified by E. R. A., which takes 3 weeks. In the meantime his family suffers. Make the W. P. A. the certifying agency and you will carry out the intention, and he can immediately go to work. This amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. VOORHIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee, along the line of the question asked by the gentleman from Ohio. Do I understand the language at the beginning of this section to mean that a man who has successfully kept himself off of relief, who has tried his best not to have to go on the relief rolls, but who has come to the place where he must have a job to keep going, is eligible for a W. P. A. job?

Mr. WOODRUM. That is my understanding of the import of the language.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 11. No alien illegally within the limits of the United States or alien who has not, prior to the date of enactment of this joint resolution, filed declaration of intention to become a citizen shall knowingly be given employment or continued in employment on any project prosecuted under the appropriations in this title: *Provided*, That preference in employment on such projects shall be given in the following order: (1) Veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration) who are in need and are American citizens; (2) other American citizens, Indians and other persons owing allegiance to the United States who are in need; and (3) those aliens in need who, prior to the date of enactment of this joint resolution, shall have declared their intention to become American citizens.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: On page 10, line 11 through 25, and on page 11, lines 1 and 2, strike out section 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"No alien shall be given employment or continued in employment on any project prosecuted under the appropriations in this title. Preference in employment on such projects shall be given in the following order: (1) Veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration) who are in need of employment and are American citizens; and (2) other American citizens, Indians, and other persons owing allegiance to the United States who are in need of employment."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, surely in a financial way our country has been long enough an international easy mark. Our people are today being compelled to pay the interest on obligations owed us by foreign governments and eventually, perhaps, will have to pay the obligations themselves. There is no foreign country within my knowledge that accords to needy American citizens work relief. As a matter of fact, no needy American citizen abroad can get private employment without a special permit, which is very difficult to procure.

Every alien who has entered this country for a great many years has had to give satisfactory assurances that he would not become a public charge. Since 1924 both the State Department and the Labor Department, since the inauguration of our quota system, have stipulated and insisted that in accordance with the law this provision be complied with. Consequently, no alien who has come into this country since 1924 is any proper object of our bounty, because of the fact he had to give assurance he would not become a public charge. Any alien who has been in this country that long or longer is certainly no proper object of our bounty unless he has been sufficiently in sympathy with our ideals and our institutions to have become a citizen of this country.

This represents my personal view. I am tired of seeing the American taxpayer bear upon his back, in addition to the burdens he is now carrying on account of debts of for-

sign nations, this obligation to pay money to aliens who came here giving assurance they would not become public charges or who have been here long enough to have become citizens if they are in sympathy with our institutions and our principles and have not done so.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman has stated this has been the law since 1924. There is no such law at all. An Executive order was issued back in 1931 by President Hoover directing the consuls on the question of aliens becoming public charges. Between 1924 and 1931 there was no such rule and no such law.

May I also call the gentleman's attention to the fact that between 1928 and 1933 the naturalization fee was \$40, and millions of aliens could not become citizens of the United States until I had that fee reduced to \$10. A further reduction is needed to give a lot of fine people who are legally in this country an opportunity to become citizens of the United States.

Mr. LANHAM. My information is to the effect that since 1924 both the State Department and the Labor Department, through the Immigration Service, have been cooperating in the enforcement of the provision, be it law or regulation, that no alien should be admitted into this country under our quotas who could not and did not give satisfactory assurance he would not become a public charge.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I know the gentleman from Texas is not as cruel as this amendment would make him out to be. I have talked with the gentleman before about this matter. I know the gentleman does not intend to starve American-born children, born here of alien parents, but that is what the gentleman's amendment would do.

The gentleman also knows the law now provides that a man must have his first citizenship papers before he is eligible. An alien in the true sense of the word is not eligible under the act. He must have shown his intention of being a citizen.

The gentleman also knows that in my city and in several other cities we have Federal judges who put such strict restrictions on some of the people who are applying for citizenship that although they try for years and years they cannot make the grade. They have it in their hearts to be citizens but cannot get the papers. The gentleman is not really sincere in proposing this amendment. I know he is not that cruel.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is one provision of this amendment that its author has not discussed at all, and it changes the original act to a great extent. In listing those who shall first receive preference, naming the veterans, the amendment provides that, instead of the words "who are in need and are American citizens", the amendment will make the bill read "who are in need of employment."

What are the inconsistencies in this bill? You have written in the bill a preference for veterans to receive this employment, but it is a preference that does not work out today, and never has worked, and, as far as actual employment is concerned, means nothing, because the way the act is administered under this very act you penalize a veteran. You say to a veteran who is drawing \$10 or \$15 a month from his Government that he is not actually in need and therefore cannot go on relief and receive work under W. P. A., whereas a nonveteran may draw \$30 or \$40 or \$50 a month from his work, whatever rate is being paid in your community to men who work under the W. P. A. You say to the veteran, "Because the Government gives you this pittance you must exist on it. You cannot be employed under W. P. A. because you are not on direct relief." The same

thing applies to a veteran who does not draw compensation, or pension as to a nonveteran, and under the bill you even discriminate among veterans.

In one section of the bill you also say the fact that a person is entitled to or has received either adjusted-service bonds or a Treasury check in payment of an adjusted-compensation certificate shall not be considered in determining actual need of such employment.

However, there are many instances of just this situation in my district. I have letters in my office on the very question and I am sure there are many such letters in the offices of other Members. A man may have received an adjusted-service certificate and bought a couple of acres of land with the \$1,000 he got from it. On that land he may have built a one-room shack and endeavored to make himself a living off the 2 acres. Then he finds he cannot do it. He cannot go on direct relief. You deprive him of the benefits of the W. P. A., although you would exempt him if he had kept the cash in hand. However, if he invested the cash in something else on which he cannot make a living you say, "Because you invested that cash we will deprive you of the opportunity of employment under the W. P. A."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. The amendment I have offered will relieve that very situation.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Yes; the gentleman's amendment will relieve it. In other words, the gentleman's amendment will do for the veteran just what you sought to do by the Jones amendment for the farmers. You not only give the veteran a preference but you say you will give preference to the veteran who is in need of employment. You differentiate between need and need of employment. They say a man is not in need when he has this pittance, but under the amendment of the gentleman from Texas, if he is in need of employment he is entitled to relief work.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRISWOLD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. What distinction is drawn between the veteran and other American citizens, including Indians? I have noticed that in his amendment the gentleman does not apply the same standard to others as he does to the veterans. He differentiates, because in one case he states, "in need of employment" and in the other instance he states, "who are in need."

Mr. GRISWOLD. I cannot tell the gentleman what was in the mind of the gentleman offering the amendment governing the Indians. I have explained this one particular feature of the amendment as it relates to the present bill and I would be pleased to have the gentleman inquire of someone else about the rest of it. I am calling the attention of the membership to this one clause only and the injustice that exists and can only be cured by the adoption of an amendment to the pending bill.

I have from the beginning opposed on the floor of the House not relief but the relief policy on which we have entered. It would be mere repetition for me to again state what I have said so many times in the past about the relief policy. Men must be kept on public money pay rolls as we have kept them for the past 6 or 7 years or we must keep them on private pay rolls.

There is no middle ground. We have given relief money to nearly 15,000,000 people. To cut them off now without notice and without provision for their maintenance would be not only inhuman and cruel but might be in fact disastrous. History is replete with the examples of what a hungry populace has done to the orderly processes of government.

I was opposed to the present system of relief, and now I am left to choose between a continuation of a policy to which I was opposed or the more disastrous results that might eventuate from the abrupt ceasing of the operation of that policy.

This bill, like some of the other relief bills, has commingled many other things with relief—matters that should

have been placed in a separate bill. This bill has in it money for construction of much-needed veterans' hospitals that have already been started. It contains an appropriation of funds from which loans and grants are made for the construction of rural electrification lines; the appropriation for the National Youth Administration to pay for the completion of school courses on which the Government has already started these boys and girls; the appropriation for loans to farmers and the money for the construction of flood-control projects that have already been started. To vote "no" on the bill would be to vote against these things that I have always advocated.

I shall vote for a motion to recommit with instructions to turn the actual administration and distribution of this relief money back to the States if such a motion is offered. I am of the opinion that it could be best administered by the States and that the taxpayer would get more for his money and the worker on relief would get more for his work. I can give you figures that I have given before to prove my point. Prior to August 1, 1935, the Federal Government granted this money to the States and the States distributed it under local control. The prevailing rate of wage was paid and in seven counties of my district, operating for 26 months under the local control system, paying the high wage, the cost of relief was an average of \$57,021.67 per month.

In these same seven counties operating under the W. P. A. system and paying the so-called security wage only, for the first 9 months the average cost per month was \$148,573.76. Under the State-control system the man on relief got more money, had more to spend with the local merchant, and the cost to the taxpayer was 60 percent less.

I will not vote for a general motion to recommit, for such a motion merely dodges the issue and avoids a vote on the merits.

Whether or not control is returned to the States, I shall vote for the bill on final passage. People must eat.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in rising against this amendment, may I say that I heartily sympathize in principle with what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] is driving at, but let us look at the way this would work in an industrial community in the Northeast. May I cite my own community? In our community of Stamford, Conn., we have been putting up about \$900,000 a year out of our own municipal pockets for relief. As you have heard this afternoon, this is more than some of the whole States of the Union have put up. Back in 1928 we put up \$40,000 a year, but right this minute it is costing us about \$900,000.

We have a great many aliens there who are older people, who came into the United States before the educational requirements were what they are today. These people are, you might say, of the old country farmer type. They are sturdy, self-respecting fine people who have raised a large family in some cases and in some cases a smaller family of good American citizens. These people are on relief. As I have demonstrated we are doing our share in our own community to help solve the relief problem. We do not believe in aliens who do not wish to become citizens being subsidized by the United States, and yet we have the problem in this industrial community of helping people who came over here years ago, who did not have the education then and, perhaps, have not the education today, to become citizens, and yet they are good residents, and I wish I might say citizens of that community.

Let me repeat, we are doing our share in the matter of relief. We are spending over \$900,000 a year and we feel the Government ought to help us.

This is a practical situation, and I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Texas is defeated. If his amendment should prevail we could not apply United States funds for the relief of these cases of noncitizens of which cases I have spoken.

Again I urge you to defeat the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, if I may submit a unanimous-consent request, I ask unanimous consent that at the end of the amendment, following the word "need", there may be added the words "of employment by."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SACKS to the amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: After the word "employment", in the last line of the amendment, insert a semicolon, and add: "those aliens in need who prior to the date of enactment of this joint resolution shall have declared their intention to become American citizens."

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Chairman, this is merely a restatement of what the law is today.

My colleagues will recall during debate when we last had this resolution up there were many people in this country, sons and daughters, who are citizens. Some of these sons fought for this country during the war, but because of educational requirements they have been unable to obtain citizenship.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SACKS. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to the gentleman, in case the amendment I have offered does not carry, I am offering another amendment containing this provision, except that I am making the exception in that amendment of those who declared their intention to become citizens prior to June 29, 1937, the date when the act went into effect, in order to avoid a great number rushing in now and declaring their intention to become citizens merely to get the advantages of this legislation.

Mr. SACKS. I will say to the gentleman that even those who have filed since June of last year I think ought to be considered because they have shown an intention to become American citizens.

I believe this provision ought not to be in the bill at all because there are many aliens who paid taxes to the Government when they were working and helped to support the Government, but for some reason they have not been able to become citizens.

I think this provision should not be in the bill, but if it is in, it should not apply to those who have wished to become citizens but have not been able to complete the course necessary to become citizens.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SACKS. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. What the gentleman from Texas has said still does not meet the proposition of the poor fellow who came in years ago and has not the educational requirements.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman that at that time they did not have the educational requirements they have now, so why did they not become citizens?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Because they were never able to get the education.

Mr. SACKS. I therefore urge my colleagues to continue the resolution as it is now by adopting my amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas, or vote both of them down. If you vote both amendments down that will leave the situation in status quo, but if you adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Texas you ought to adopt my amendment and show some humanitarian feeling toward these individuals.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, every time this matter of aliens is mentioned I know that a great many of us get

unduly excited. I know that some gentlemen, especially from the South, who come from districts where they do not happen to have any aliens or people of foreign extraction, are not as well acquainted with the problem as some of us who come from the northern districts. If we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], we will not be punishing any aliens. You can put that down as a fact. This bill provides, in section 11, page 10, line 11, that "no alien illegally within the limits of the United States, or alien who has not, prior to the date of enactment of this joint resolution, filed declaration of intention to become a citizen" shall be given employment. We will be punishing American-born children, born of parents who have their first papers. You cannot deport those people. They are here legally, and they will stay here; but you will take bread and butter away from their children, American children. You will let them starve, or you will make criminals out of them, and you will put them in jail, and some day someone will see a foreign name in the newspapers of some man who has gone to jail, and they will say, "Look at that foreigner going to jail," and it will be you who will have sent him there, because you did not give him an opportunity for education, you did not give him those chances that every American citizen is entitled to have. You, the Congress of the United States, will be responsible. These people are entitled to the same opportunities, whether they are first-generation Americans or whether they are *Mayflower* Americans. They are entitled to the same privileges; and if you are going to fight somebody, for God's sake do not fight little children. That is not the business of Congress. No one of us has it in his heart to be that cruel, no matter what part of the country he comes from.

You cannot be that vicious. It is because of ignorance, or because of political propaganda, or because some people think it is good demagoguery that they would be willing to vote that way. Let me cite a case that came up in my own district. It is the case of a man named Joe Krivitz who lived in my district and had for about 12 or 15 years unsuccessfully tried to get his second papers. He had his first papers. He applied repeatedly to the Federal court in my city but could not get his citizenship papers. Then because of the ill health of his wife, he moved to Alabama, in the Mobile district, where our good friend and former colleague, John McDuffie is now sitting as a Federal judge. Joe Krivitz went down there, and applied for citizenship before Judge McDuffie, and he got his papers. Judge McDuffie said, "Joe, how long have you been in this country?" Joe told him, and also informed him that he was a married man and had some American-born children that he was bringing up as good, respectable, God-fearing citizens. Then Judge McDuffie asked him if he had ever been arrested, or if he had ever been convicted of any crime or committed any wrong. Joe told him that he had not. Then the judge said, "O. K., Joe, you will make a good citizen", and Joe got his papers. But you cannot do that in Detroit, or in certain parts of Pennsylvania, or in certain other districts, where you have these vicious Federal judges sitting who have one idea in mind and that is to make life miserable for some poor soul.

Why, the Members of Congress would have a difficult time to answer some of the questions that are asked by these Federal judges. It is unfair to deprive a good, honest, human being who has raised his family properly and respectfully and has entered this country legally—has taken out his first papers and has made every effort to obtain his second papers, from the right to work; the right to feed, clothe, and educate his children. It is not only unfair but it is un-American. I sincerely hope that this amendment is defeated.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, the section now in the bill certainly should go far enough to satisfy any member of the House who is inclined to feel somewhat hostile to the practice of giving W. P. A. employment to aliens. The provisions of the bill go further than I would be willing to have them go, but certainly I hope the membership of the House will not approve the drastic provisions contained in the amendment proposed by the distinguished gentleman from

Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. That amendment goes too far. There is no justification in permitting aliens to live in this country, permitting them to be here, and then not giving them an opportunity to at least eke out a living, a subsistence. Some gentlemen on the floor, in discussing this problem, seem to think that this W. P. A. subsistence income is a splendid income. Some seem to think it is a choice plum to be distributed only to American citizens. Some think that only the higher types of citizens, according to education and culture, perhaps, or some other standard, should have these jobs. I submit that W. P. A. wages are so low that any one living within the territorial boundaries of the United States should not be deprived of that minimum income for the purpose of sustaining life. I think it is deplorable to even consider preventing aliens who are here legally within the United States and who have filed their first papers, from at least this little income.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will the gentleman emphasize that under the provisions of law as provided in section 11, no alien who is here illegally can get relief of any kind.

Mr. BOILEAU. That is correct.

Mr. WOODRUM. Nor can any alien get work relief at all unless prior to the time of this becoming a law unless he has filed his first papers.

Mr. BOILEAU. That is correct.

Mr. WOODRUM. And even then American citizens and veterans have preference over that alien.

Mr. BOILEAU. That is correct. I do not personally agree to the provisions contained in this section but certainly you do not want to go any further than that. Certainly that is as far as you want to go in discriminating against people who merely ask for bread.

This section of the bill goes further than I would want to go. Certainly we do not want to go further than the provisions of this section. We want to be fair to these people. The gentleman from Indiana pointed out something about veterans' preference and the distinguished gentleman from Texas, a man for whom I have the most profound regard, modified the amendment so as to deal with veterans who are in need of employment. That is a better provision than is contained in this bill so far as veterans are concerned, but that should not influence the Members of this House in voting upon this proposition, because if you vote down the Lanham amendment you can still change the situation. So the veterans' question is not involved at all in this proposition. The only question involved in that amendment is the question of relief for aliens.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOILEAU. I yield.

Mr. SACKS. Is it not better to vote down the amendment of the gentleman from Texas, or if you vote my amendment down vote them both down?

Mr. BOILEAU. I agree that the gentleman's amendment is an improvement. The only fair thing to do is to vote them both down so there will not be any question about what the committee wants.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: Page 10, lines 11 through 25, and on page 11, lines 1 and 2, strike out section 11 and insert in lieu thereof, the following:

"No alien who is not legally in the United States and no alien who has not prior to June 29, 1937, filed declaration of intention

to become a citizen shall be given employment or continued in employment on any project prosecuted under the appropriations in this title: *Provided*, That preference in employment on such projects shall be given in the following order: (1) Veterans of the World War and the Spanish-American War and veterans of any campaign or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration) who are in need of employment and are American citizens; (2) other American citizens, Indians, and other persons owing allegiance to the United States who are in need of employment; and (3) those aliens in need who are legally in the United States and who prior to June 29, 1937, have declared their intention to become American citizens."

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman from Texas. All time has expired on this section, and all amendments thereto.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANHAM) there were—ayes 58, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRISWOLD: On page 10, line 22, after the word "in", insert the word "actual", and after the word "need", insert the words "of employment."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. PHILLIPS. In opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman. All debate on this section has been closed.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 12. No person employed on work projects under the appropriations in this title and in need who refuses a bona fide offer of private employment under reasonable working conditions which pays as much or more in compensation for the same length of service as such person receives or could receive under such appropriations and who is capable of performing such work, shall be retained in employment for the period such private employment would be available: *Provided*, That any person who takes such private employment shall at the expiration thereof be entitled to immediate resumption of his previous employment status if he is still in need and if he has lost the private employment through no fault of his own.

Sec. 13. Appointments to Federal positions of an administrative or advisory capacity under the appropriations in this title in any State shall be made from among the bona fide citizens of that State so far as not inconsistent with efficient administration.

So far as not inconsistent with efficient administration no part of the appropriations in this title shall be available to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the United States who holds an administrative, executive, or supervisory position under this joint resolution, if the position is in any office located outside the District of Columbia or is on any project prosecuted in any place outside the District of Columbia, unless such person is an actual and bona fide citizen of the State, Territory, region, or district in which the office or project is situated, but this provision shall not apply to the temporary and emergency assignment of any person to a position where the period of service in such position does not exceed 60 days.

Sec. 14. No part of any appropriation in this title shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any person in a supervisory or administrative position who is a candidate for any State, district, county, or municipal office (such office requiring full time of such person and to which office a salary or per diem attaches), in any primary, general or special election, or who is serving as a campaign manager or assistant thereto for any such candidate.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, the remaining sections in title I down to page 17 contain nothing particularly controversial. I ask unanimous consent that these sections may be considered as having been read, be printed in the RECORD, and that they be now open to amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am inclined to believe that it would be better to proceed in order.

Mr. WOODRUM. I was just trying to save a little time.

Mr. TABER. I do not think you will save any time.

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILCOX: Page 12, lines 10 and 11, after the word "person", strike out "in a supervisory or administrative position"; in line 12, after the word "any", insert "Federal"; in line 16, after the word "candidate", strike out the period and insert the words "or who is actively campaigning for any such candidate", so that the section when so amended will read as follows:

"Sec. 14. No part of any appropriation in this title shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any person who is a candidate for any Federal, State, county or municipal office (such office requiring full time of such person and to which office a salary or per diem attaches), in any primary, general, or special election, or who is serving as a campaign manager or assistant thereto for any such candidate or who is actively campaigning for any such candidate."

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of clarifying section 14. May I say in the beginning that I compliment the subcommittee in the preparation of this bill and for the courageous manner in which they have recognized the necessity for providing against political manipulation of relief funds. The difficulty with the section as written is that it does not accomplish the purpose which the Committee had in mind.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to discuss the amendment which I have offered in proper order as applied to the section. The section as written in the bill begins with this statement:

No part of any appropriation in this title shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any person in a supervisory or administrative position who is a candidate—

And so forth.

As written, I submit that language would not reach persons who are employed in the so-called white-collar class. I should like to call attention of the membership of the House to the fact that under the terms of this bill and under the Works Progress Administration as heretofore carried on, white-collar jobs are the places in which politics can be and are being played. I should like to call attention, for example, to this type of project: In my State recently, at a time when thousands of people were hungry and in need of employment, \$84,000 of relief money was set aside for the purpose of creating a white-collar project known as a tourist survey. In other words, \$84,000 was set aside for the purpose of ascertaining how many tourists came to my State last year and from where they came. Those persons employed on that type of project are not relief people. They were paid salaries in some instances as high as \$200 per month. They were paid \$150 and \$175, regardless of need and regardless of the position which their families may have occupied.

Under this section as written, persons could still draw \$150 or \$175 a month on one of these white-collar jobs and still be a candidate or the campaign manager for a candidate. If we are really, honestly, and seriously concerned about work relief, and not about setting up a political machine, we must provide against the appointment of political parasites and camp followers to positions on these white-collar projects.

I should like to call your attention to the further language in the section as written, proceeding from the point where I just left off, as follows:

who is a candidate for any State, district, county, or municipal office.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if we are actually going to provide against political use of this money, there is no particular reason why we should limit this to State and county officers and still permit it to be used for Federal offices. Are we to infer that Congress has deliberately left the door open to use these funds to influence congressional elections? So my amendment seeks to add the word "Federal" so that no

part of it may be used for a Federal, State, county, or municipal office. Then at the end of the section it states the money shall not be used for the payment of the salary of any person who is serving as "campaign manager or assistant thereto." It is easy enough to have campaign workers on the pay roll without designating them as "campaign managers" or "assistant campaign managers"; therefore I have added at the end of the sentence, "or who is actively campaigning for any such candidate."

I am addressing myself entirely to my own party Members of the House. May I say, Mr. Chairman, there are thousands of people in this country today who believe honestly and conscientiously that the Works Progress Administration is a huge political organization. Many people believe that the object of this bill is to provide the funds to influence coming elections. We cannot escape the proposition that we are approaching our primary elections and the general election in the fall. If there is anything in the world that our party needs to do at this time it is to restore the confidence of the people in the honesty of the Democratic Party in providing relief funds for relief purposes.

You and I are striving to provide jobs for the needy unemployed who want to work. Let us not, by our refusal to safeguard these funds against political manipulation, plead guilty to the charge that Congress is setting up a huge fund to control political elections. I appeal to my Democratic colleagues to show to the world that the charges of our enemies are false and that we are determined to see to it that relief funds are used for the relief of suffering, needy, hungry, unemployed, and not for politics.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not press that. All day we have been going along under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. WILCOX. May I say to the gentleman that from the standpoint of the prestige of his party and mine, this is a very important question.

Mr. WOODRUM. Many of these things are important and much of the bill that is important still remains to be acted on and we have to finish it tonight.

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WILCOX].

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman how he feels about that portion of his amendment which undertakes to strike out of the present law the words "supervisory or administrative position"? The provision which is already in the bill does not apply to supervisory or administrative positions. That is to say, if a man is a foreman or occupies some minor position in a State organization, it does not take away his right of citizenship if he should wish to become a candidate for public office.

I am very much in sympathy with the principal part of the gentleman's amendment which undertakes to make this applicable to Federal as well as State offices.

Mr. WILCOX. The gentleman asked me a question. Will he permit me to answer?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WILCOX. I answered the question while the gentleman was reading my amendment. The section says that no part of the fund shall be used to pay the salary of any person engaged in an administrative or supervisory capacity. It would not, however, prevent the use of politics in white-collar jobs paying \$150 or \$200 per month on such projects as the tourist-survey project to which I just referred. If

you are going to eliminate these people from politics, let us take them all out of it and say that no part of this money shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of anybody who is running for any sort of office.

Mr. WOODRUM. While I am heartily in sympathy with the object the gentleman seeks to accomplish—and I am confident the House is—on the other hand, I do not believe that because a man happens to have a position of some kind all of his rights as an American citizen should be taken away from him. The adoption of this amendment as the gentleman has drawn it just about does that. If my recollection serves me correctly and if my information is correct, a distinguished Member of this body is sitting on the floor now who would not have been elected if this amendment had been law, and nobody suggests there was anything wrong in his election to public office. I believe there is a happy medium we can reach. If the gentleman would be willing to put in the word "Federal" to make this law apply to Federal positions as well as State, county, and municipal positions, although I cannot speak for the committee, I personally would have no objection to it.

Mr. WILCOX. Would the gentleman have any objection to the remainder of the amendment?

Mr. WOODRUM. I believe that should go out. I think it is going pretty far when you extend it down the line to minor positions.

Mr. WILCOX. May I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that if we eliminate the word "administrative" there is still another part of my amendment which states that no part of this money shall go to pay the salary or expenses of any person who is actively campaigning for a candidate.

Mr. WOODRUM. I have no objection to that.

Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Montana. Mr. O'CONNELL of Montana. Is it not true that under a ruling of the Comptroller General this provision as written in this law applies to all, whether people in an administrative capacity or project workers or anyone else?

Mr. WOODRUM. I am not acquainted with that.

If the gentleman from Florida will modify his amendment, I have no objection to it, personally. Of course, I cannot speak for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida modify his amendment?

Mr. WILCOX. Mr. Chairman, I think it is fundamental. If that amendment is going to do any good it ought to go through the way it is.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 12, line 8, after the period strike out Section 14 in its entirety.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this substitute amendment, to strike out section 14 in its entirety, for this reason: According to the wording of the original section, as well as the amendment which has just been placed before you, American citizens are deprived of their right to run for public office if on relief and in slightly better relief jobs. The amendment also deprives the community from which they come and where they live of the right to their services. Both of these propositions are un-American. I am willing to concede there may be some politics in relief. I hope there are not, but I do not believe you can get away from it. Show me in life, show me any society, show me any club, or, almost, show me any church organization where there is not politics of some kind, maybe not Democrat and Republican, but Mary Jones and Bill Smith politics, and if you can do this I will concede that by writing a law you can take politics out of some large human relationships. In short, I believe that you cannot take politics 100 percent out of anything in Government or anything else in human nature. Conceding this, do not deprive some

poor fellow who perhaps cannot get a job of his right as an American citizen to run for public office just because he may be a better and more intelligent type of individual and hence gets a little better job in the W. P. A. or some governmental relief activity. Do not deprive his community of the right to have his services, either. It is indeed un-American to deprive a citizen of his right to run for public office and to deprive his community of his services simply because, for example, his factory where he works is closed and he cannot get a job.

I hope you will vote for my substitute and thus strike this section out in its entirety.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut is not a substitute. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida is a perfecting amendment and therefore has precedence.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WILCOX].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOODRUM) there were—ayes 77, noes 75.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WILCOX and Mr. WOODRUM.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 79, noes 110.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PHILLIPS) there were—ayes 13, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 12, lines 10 and 11, strike out "in a supervisory or administrative position" and insert "receiving a salary in excess of \$75 per month."

In line 12, after the word "any" insert the word "Federal" and a comma.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to try to accomplish the purposes that seem to be agreed upon as already expressed in the debate.

The section would read, with my amendment, as follows:

No part of any appropriation in this title shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any person receiving in excess of \$75 per month who is a candidate for any Federal, State, district, county, or municipal office,

And so forth. This would meet the situation that has been raised by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WILCOX] because it would stop anybody who is receiving a salary of \$150 or \$200 a month, but at the same time it would permit the people who are on ordinary relief, those living in rural sections and who are receiving relief or grants from the Farm Security Administration and those in towns who are working on ordinary W. P. A. jobs, to run for county office.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Gladly.

Mr. BOILEAU. I am not sure what the rates are in your city, for instance, but it is my recollection that white-collared jobs and professional men working on W. P. A. projects in New York City receive in excess of \$75 a month. Would the gentleman want to preclude them from running for a position on the school board or for the position of supervisor or positions of that kind?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, this bill goes on to say "such office requiring full time of such person and to which office a salary or per diem attaches," and therefore a position on a school board would not be affected.

Mr. BOILEAU. How about any other kind of position or city office or State office?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, if they are getting more than \$75 they are in fairly good positions and do not need to run for office. I have in mind a specific instance of a young man who used to be employed at a creamery station. He was working at \$50 or \$60 a month when times got bad and he lost his job and went on relief at about \$40 a month. He was just an average citizen in a rural community and he wanted to run for the position of clerk of courts, a position which would not pay more than eleven or twelve hundred dollars in that particular county, yet under the present law he is barred from running. His particular problem will be solved by the section in the bill as before us but, as was brought out by the gentleman from Florida, the section will not reach highly paid project workers who are not supervisors.

My amendment seeks to cover both situations. It would permit the ordinary citizens on relief to run for county offices because they are not getting \$75 per month, yet it would prevent those who are in a position to crack the whip, so to speak, from using their position to corral votes for any office.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In other words, if I understand the gentleman right, he would let the man out in the rural districts run for office, if he were out of a job and on relief, but in the cities they could not do that?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Oh, no; not necessarily; not unless he were getting over \$75 a month. I took that as the dividing line because I remember when we had up the relief bill for this city, a \$75 limitation was written into the bill. This would let the average worker in the city of Washington, or in any other city, town, or county, getting up to \$75 a month run for office, but it would prevent the man who is in a position to capitalize on his administrative authority or on an especially profitable connection with W. P. A., to use such benefits in a political way.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In other words, the gentleman is willing to admit the proposition that if some poor devil is out of work and cannot get a job and yet may be capable of handling a job, and could be of service to himself and his community by running for office—the gentleman is willing to admit that he agrees with the proposition that such a man should not run for office?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Oh, no; the amendment opens the way for him. It does not place any limitation with respect to the city or the country so far as that is concerned. The limitation is simply that if he is getting more than \$75 a month out of relief and thereby is in a position where he would have supervisory or administrative power or more than ordinary funds to use for political purposes—

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Is it not true that in some of the projects in the Southern States the foreman and supervisors get less than \$75 a month and they would still be permitted to participate in politics and therefore the matter brought up by the gentleman from Florida would not be corrected?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would be corrected because the gentleman from Florida referred to people who get \$150 or \$200 a month.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I only rise here to say in opposition to this amendment that this certainly is not a very encouraging view of American statesmanship that we see here when

Members of Congress would deprive their fellow Americans of their constitutional rights simply because they are unfortunate enough to be on relief. This would deny to Americans who are on relief their inalienable rights to become a part of this Government if they feel like exercising those rights. To think that here in this Hall some \$10,000-a-year men are afraid some poor \$75-a-month reliefer is going to be a candidate for election would deny a man that right is hardly a credit to the history of this forum. Why spend time on an amendment like this? The next thing some of the Bourbons in government would do if this were passed would be to try enact a law that you cannot run for office in the United States unless you put up a bond or show that you are a rich man. That is what this amendment actually proposes to do. I say whether a man is on relief or not, he is entitled to all his constitutional rights, and this amendment should be defeated if for no other reason than to show that misfortune does not affect any American's civil rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 15. Hereafter, so far as not inconsistent with efficient administration, all appointments of persons to the Federal service for employment within the District of Columbia, under the provisions of this joint resolution, whether such appointments be within the classified civil service or otherwise, shall be apportioned among the several States and the District of Columbia upon the basis of population as ascertained at the last preceding census.

In making separations from the Federal service, or furloughs without pay to last as long as 3 months, of persons employed within the District of Columbia, under the provisions of this joint resolution the appointing power shall give preference, as nearly as good administration will warrant, in retention to appointees from States that have not received their share of appointments according to population: *Provided, however*, That soldiers, sailors, and marines, the widows of such, or the wives of injured soldiers, sailors, and marines, who themselves are not qualified, but whose wives are qualified to hold a position in the Government service, shall be given preference in retention, in their several grades and classes, where their ratings are good or better.

SEC. 16. The provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation and benefits shall apply to persons (except administrative employees qualifying as civil employees of the United States) receiving compensation from the appropriations in this title for services rendered as employees of the United States and to persons receiving assistance in the form of payments from the United States for services rendered under the National Youth Administration created by Executive order of June 26, 1935: *Provided*, That so much of the appropriation in section 1 of this title to the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, as the Commission, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, estimates and certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury will be necessary for the payment of such compensation and administrative expenses shall be set aside in a special fund to be available and to be administered by the Commission during the fiscal year 1939 for such purposes; and after June 30, 1939, such special fund shall be added to and become part of the "Employees' Compensation Fund, Emergency Relief", set up in accordance with the provisions of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1939: *Provided further*, That said "Employees' Compensation Fund, Emergency Relief" and the special fund herein authorized shall not be limited in its use to the United States, its Territories, and possessions and any payments heretofore made to persons outside the United States, its Territories, and possessions from the special funds set aside to be administered by said Commission, if otherwise valid, are hereby validated: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply in any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State or Territory, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

SEC. 17. In carrying out the purpose of the appropriations in this title, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations for the establishment of special funds for the Procurement Division, Branch of Supply, Treasury Department, and the Works Progress Administration, in the nature of revolving funds for use, until June 30, 1939, in the purchase, repair, distribution, or rental of materials, supplies, equipment, and tools.

SEC. 18. The provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not apply to any purchase made or service procured in connection with the foregoing appropriation when the aggregate amount involved is less than \$300.

SEC. 19. Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States makes any false statement in connection with any application for any project, employment, or relief aid under

the appropriations in this title, or diverts, or attempts to divert or assists in diverting, for the benefit of any person or persons not entitled thereto, any portion of such appropriation, or any services or real or personal property acquired thereunder, or who knowingly, by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott, or discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliations, or membership in a labor organization, deprives any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under any such appropriation, or attempts so to do, or assists in so doing, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARTON: Page 16, line 3, insert a new section as follows:

"PROHIBITED PRACTICES"

"SEC. 19-A. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person having power, or representing himself in any manner whatsoever, as having power, to grant or withhold, or to influence the granting or withholding of, benefits from the United States—

"(1) To interfere with, restrain, or coerce any individual in the exercise of his right to vote at any election;

"(2) By discrimination, threatened or otherwise, in regard to the granting or withholding of benefits from the United States to encourage or discourage membership in, or contributions to, any political party;

"(3) To discriminate against any person in regard to the withholding of benefits from the United States because such person has filed charges or given testimony under this Act;

"(4) To discriminate against any individual in regard to the withholding of benefits from the United States because such individual has voted at any election as he saw fit; or against any person because such person is a member of, or has made contributions to, the political party, of his own choosing; or

"(5) To discriminate against any corporation in regard to the withholding of benefits from the United States because any officer or director thereof is a member of, or has made contributions to, the political party of his own choosing.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any individual having power to grant or withhold benefits from the United States to act as election official, watcher, or in any other capacity at any polling place in any election.

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any person, corporate or individual, who receives any benefits from the United States as herein defined in this Act, to contribute to a political party or any agency thereof for any purpose whatsoever, directly or indirectly, through advertising, sales, discount, or the purchase of campaign books, periodicals, calendars, autographs, or similar devices. The provisions of this subsection shall be in addition to and not in lieu of section 313 of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

"PENALTIES"

"Any person who violates any provision of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished—

"(a) In the case of an individual by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than three years, or both;

"(b) In all other cases by a fine of not more than \$25,000."

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that any Member of the House who voted for the Wagner Labor Relations Act would logically want to support this amendment. The Wagner Act seeks to protect any employee from any political coercion of any sort on the part of an employer. We have in that act protected every employee from every employer except the greatest employer of all, which is the United States Government. This greatest employer is not free from the suspicion that in various parts of the country employment has been withheld or withdrawn because of political considerations. I ask merely that we apply the same philosophy to the United States Government which the Wagner Relations Act has applied to the private employer. It is not a partisan question as I see it. The majority as well as the minority is anxious to take politics out of relief. The way to take politics out of relief is to put a couple of people in jail somewhere as an example to the rest, and then we will have this whole thing cleaned up. I trust the chairman of the committee will regard this as a nonpartisan amendment and that it will be agreed to by the committee.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, of course I do not question the high patriotic purpose of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BARTON] in offering this amendment, which I heard hurriedly read for the first time at the Clerk's desk. No Member of Congress, I assume, wants to see relief funds used for political purposes or any scandal connected with it if it is possible to keep it out. I am confident that the Administrator, Mr. Hopkins, does not want it. I question, however, whether you would be able to get it all out. Where men are running for office and want to be elected to office, things will just happen. I am in sympathy with the purpose of trying to keep relief as clean as it can be kept. We have in this bill two sections dealing with this subject, section 14 and section 19, the latter a penalty section. The committee framing this legislation had long open hearings. Members of the House of Representatives were welcome to come and make suggestions. Every suggestion made to the committee by Members of the House was carefully considered, and some of them incorporated in the legislation. I submit to the membership of the House here today that it is not possible in an orderly and logical way to write this kind of legislation, without any previous consideration, into a bill of this sort as an amendment under such circumstances as we are under today.

Mr. BARTON. Does not the gentleman feel that my amendment strengthens the provisions already in the bill and would be a step toward the goal that he and all of us want to attain?

Mr. WOODRUM. The amendment certainly sounded fine, but it is a long amendment, it is complex, it is comprehensive. Presenting it for the first time in this way is not in the interest of logical and orderly procedure. It is not possible to consider intricate amendments of this kind under pressure in the limited time we have available today. The committee having in charge the bill has had no opportunity of considering the amendment or of consulting the administrative officials who are to administer this law. This is a relief measure. We are trying to provide jobs for people, and we want to give them to them as quickly as possible. We do not want to inject matters that will slow up the program and cause administrative difficulties that may prevent everything that we are trying to accomplish.

If this amendment were brought on as a piece of substantive legislation where we could sit down and consider it deliberately and amend it the way we wanted to, I might vote for it myself; I probably would; but handling the bill the way we are today, we cannot undertake to amend it by grabbing everything that sounds fine and putting it in. I hope the amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BARTON) there were—ayes 48, noes 87.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 20. The Works Progress Administrator is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine and pay from the appropriation to the Works Progress Administration in this title any claim arising out of operations thereunder accruing after the effective date of this title on account of damage to or loss of property caused by the negligence of an employee of the Works Progress Administration or of the National Youth Administration while acting within the scope of his employment: *Provided*, That no claim shall be considered hereunder which is in excess of \$500, or which is not presented in writing to the administration within 1 year from the date of accrual thereof: *Provided further*, That acceptance by any claimant of the amount allowed on account of his claim shall be deemed to be in full settlement thereof, and the action of the administrator upon such claim so accepted by the claimant shall be conclusive.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this section speaks of damage to or loss of property. Is there any place in this bill or in present law where provision is made for payment of claims for injury to person or loss of life?

Mr. WOODRUM. Section 16 puts the matter under the jurisdiction of the Employees' Compensation Commission.

Mr. BIERMANN. That applies only to persons employed in W. P. A.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is correct.

Mr. BIERMANN. I refer to cases where a W. P. A. employee in the scope of his employment injures a private citizen.

Mr. WOODRUM. There is nothing in the bill except section 16, which has been read.

Mr. BIERMANN. This does not provide for any compensation for personal injury?

Mr. WOODRUM. Not for personal injury; no.

Mr. BIERMANN. Then what redress would a person have who was injured by a W. P. A. employee?

Mr. WOODRUM. A person receiving injury by a W. P. A. employee would, of course, have to have a private bill introduced for his relief.

Mr. BIERMANN. And that would be his only remedy?

Mr. WOODRUM. That would be his only remedy.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Does section 16 apply to diseases incurred by members of the Civilian Conservation Corps?

Mr. WOODRUM. I think they come under the Employees' Compensation Act, but I do not think it applies to disease; it applies only to traumatic injuries. They are the only ones to which the Compensation Act applies.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 21. Reports of the operations under the appropriations in this joint resolution and the appropriation contained in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1937, as supplemented, including a statement of the expenditures made and obligations incurred by classes, projects, and amounts shall be submitted by the President to Congress on or before the 15th of January in each of the next two regular sessions of Congress: *Provided*, That such reports shall be in lieu of the report required by section 14 of such act of 1937.

SEC. 22. No part of the funds made available in this joint resolution shall be loaned or granted, except pursuant to an obligation incurred prior to the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, to any State, or any of its political subdivisions or agencies, for the purpose of carrying out or assisting in carrying out any program or project of constructing, rebuilding, repairing, or replanning its penal or reformatory institutions, unless the President shall find that the projects to be financed with such loan or grant will not cause or promote competition of the products of convict labor with the products of free labor.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAUTHOFF: Page 17, after line 14, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 23. In the expenditure of funds made available by this joint resolution for any public construction project, preference shall be given, wherever possible, to the utilization of materials and supplies purchasable in the locality where such project is proposed to be constructed."

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to this injustice which I think is now being done to the local merchants, the small independent merchants in the communities in which these projects are constructed. Under the usual procedure, the Federal Government calls for bids for vast quantities of materials. The large companies in the big centers bid and get the business. The local merchant in the smaller cities and villages is deprived of that business and cannot in any way get any of it because he cannot compete under those bids.

The difficulty with the local merchant is that he has a hard struggle for existence, particularly against the chains. He is fighting for his very existence. This business would be of considerable value to him in the local community. He is one of those who supports the local community. He pays taxes on his business. He helps support schools and all the civic matters pertaining to his local community. He hires help in that community. Take that business away from him and the first thing you know his help will be out of work and applying for relief.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I just wonder why the gentleman has not added, and I say this sincerely, words to this effect: "And in no case shall imported goods or materials be used."

Mr. SAUTHOFF. What does the gentleman mean, foreign importations?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Exactly.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I would gladly join in that but I know the ruling that would be made, that this would interfere with the reciprocal-trade agreements which I have been fighting ever since I came here; and, therefore, I would not have a chance of getting the amendment through. I do want to give some help and protection to the independent merchant, the little fellow who cannot get a loan from the R. F. C. unless he can show that the collateral he has to offer is good enough to get a loan from his local bank. In spite of the fact that 2½ months have elapsed since that agency has been empowered to make such loans, only \$20,400,000 has been granted to date to the little fellow to help him save his business, while applications for three times that much get no consideration. As was well said by one of the columnists recently, "The little fellow is getting the run-around." If you want to help the dealer in your community, here is your chance. He needs our help; he needs the business. Let us help him in his struggle for existence, and thereby also help his employees and his town.

Let us give him whatever local business there is, whatever he can possibly get out of it, and keep him alive. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

Mr. Chairman, of course, nobody will take issue with the fact that where these materials can be bought in a local community that should be done. The answer is it is being done. But this amendment goes very much further than that. It provides that all the funds made available in this joint resolution, not only W. P. A. but in the ensuing sections, the heavy construction sections, preference shall be given to local communities, notwithstanding the fact that under the general law we require them to receive competitive bids. In the interest of fair, open trade, and fair, open competition, one section with another, and one place with another, I think it would be a very dangerous thing to write that principle into the law. I do not think the Congress would wish to do that; therefore, I hope the Committee will not write such a broad, comprehensive amendment into the bill.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. The gentleman will note that in the amendment it is stated "wherever possible."

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; but the congressional mandate there will be used, and it will be urged upon administrative officials to disregard the low competitive bids and buy goods in local communities because it is a local community. It sounds fine from the standpoint of the citizen of a local community, but it is a dangerous broad policy to write into a bill when we require them, on the other hand, to do these jobs and buy materials on competitive bids where they can be bought in the open market in competition.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAUTHOFF) there were—ayes 36, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I offer another amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAUTHOFF: On page 17, after line 14, insert a new section, as follows:

"Sec. 23. No part of the funds made available in this joint resolution shall be used for a loan or a grant or a loan and grant in the form of (a) money, or (b) work or materials or both, or (c) a project on an amortized lease basis, to any State or Territory or any political subdivision or public body thereof for any public construction project unless oppressive child labor is prohibited in such State or Territory.

"The term 'oppressive child labor' as used in this section is defined as a condition of employment under which (1) any employee under the age of 16 years is employed by an employer (other than a parent or a person standing in place of a parent employing his own child or a child in his custody under the age of 16 years in an occupation other than manufacturing or mining) in any occupation or (2) any such employee between the ages of 16 and 18 years is employed by an employer in any occupation which the chief of the children's bureau shall from time to time find and by order declare to be particularly hazardous for the employment of such children or detrimental to their health or well-being.

"Oppressive child labor is not deemed to exist by virtue of the employment in any occupation of a person with respect to whom the employer shall have on file a certificate issued and held pursuant to the regulations of the chief of the children's bureau certifying that such person is above the oppressive child-labor age. The chief of the children's bureau is to provide by regulation or by order that the employment of employees of or above the age of 14 but under the age of 16 in occupations other than manufacturing and mining shall not be deemed to constitute oppressive child labor if and to the extent that the chief of the children's bureau determines that such employment is confined to periods which will not interfere with schooling and to conditions which will not interfere with the health and well-being."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, my object in offering this amendment is to put an end to child labor, for this amendment specifically provides that no State or political subdivision thereof will be entitled to any money herein appropriated unless oppressive child labor is prohibited in that State. Oppressive child labor, I may say, is defined exactly as defined in the wage and hour bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have an opportunity here to vote to put an end to child labor, something we have been attempting to do for over 30 years in this country and have not yet succeeded. We can do it with an amendment of this kind by shutting out States that will not come in under it. Inside of 30 days those States will come under the provision in order to qualify so that they may get some of the money. I know the point will be made that we are going to vote for the wage and hour bill and that this section is contained in the wage and hour bill. That is true, and I will be one of those to vote for that bill. I want to point out, however, that a rumor has been going around today that when the wage and hour bill gets over in the Senate you are going to have the antilynching bill attached to it, and the wage and hour bill will be filibustered to death. This will be the only opportunity, as I see it, to put child labor out of business, which we have been trying to do for so many years in this country.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I understand there are some 14 or 16 States that have not yet adopted the amendment to prohibit child labor. Might it not be possible under the gentleman's amendment for three or four of those States to get together and materials would have to be shipped across five or six States to get to a particular location?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I do not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. MAY. Suppose 14 States lying in one particular section of the country had not adopted the child-labor amendment and you could not buy materials in those States. Might you not have to ship the materials from the East or the far West?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. If this amendment is adopted, you will have the Governor of the affected State calling a special session because he is not going to lose these millions. The gentleman knows that, and I know it. This amendment is a mighty practical way by which to obtain the child-labor amendment inside of 30 days. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment on its face undertakes to deal with the subject of the regulation of child labor. It is not germane and is not appropriately to be dealt with in this particular bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Only to this extent, Mr. Chairman, that the section in question refers to the funds and the availability of the funds, and this is all my amendment does.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Virginia makes the point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin that it is not germane, and in support of that point of order directs attention to the scope covered by the amendment.

The Chair has examined the language contained in the amendment and it appears that if the limitation applied solely to the funds for the projects provided for in the bill the position taken by the gentleman from Wisconsin might be sound; but the Chair is of the opinion that the point raised by the gentleman from Virginia to the effect that this amendment would require affirmative child-labor legislation in every State which might not now have such legislation is valid in that such a provision makes the amendment too broad and therefore not germane.

Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 23. This title may be cited as the "Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1938."

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I want to express briefly my reactions to the Roosevelt depression in relation to the pending pump-priming legislation.

This is a Democratic, Roosevelt depression, panic, or whatever name you care to give it. That is what we have to deal with at this moment and we should not mince words about it.

As a Republican Congressman I am called upon to vote on this proposition. What shall I do as a Republican and a Member of Congress, responsible for my actions in regard to this crisis in the affairs of our country?

To start with, we all know that the President and the Democratic Congress have miserably failed in these past 6 years to restore prosperity and bring about recovery. Pump priming has failed of lasting results and proved only a shot in the arm. The usual reaction has followed such a policy and we find ourselves about where we were in March 1933, with something like twelve or fifteen million walking the streets in vain begging for jobs they cannot find.

What do we owe to the people in this matter? What do we owe to the unemployed and those who know not where to seek bread for themselves and their children?

As to the people, is it not the penalty of their carelessness in almost unanimously thrusting overwhelming power into the hands of the Democratic Party which has miserably failed to bring recovery, to pay for their actions? Less than 2 years ago the electoral vote of 46 States voted to keep the "old fiddler," and why now should they not pay the "fiddler?" Surely the millions of unemployed are not entirely to blame. They too may have voted wrong, but we must not let them starve in the richest country on the earth. We must all pay for this even if it is not our fault. The unemployed should not suffer because the Democratic Party or its executive leaders have not possessed the creative and constructive ability to deal with this depression, but in fact have created a new depression by reason of their ignorance and duplicity which have destroyed the confidence of the business world in our national leadership and unsound legislation of the New Deal. We will have no recovery until private business puts men back on the pay roll and keeps them there; but the Democratic Party has, like the old Bourbons, learned nothing and forgot nothing, and are proceeding to

repeat the same old blunders which have paralyzed industry and business and produced the twelve or fifteen millions of unemployed.

One of the reasons why one might refuse to vote for this measure is that when it is passed the Democratic Party will practically appropriate these billions to elect a Democratic Congress. There has not been a more disgraceful page in the political history of our country than the brazen effrontery of the Democratic Party in using public money for political purposes; and what blacker political crime could stain the record of any party than corrupting the elections at the expense of the Public Treasury?

These funds will not only be utilized against Republicans, but also against patriotic Democrats who have dared to oppose the grasp for arbitrary power by the executive department and the corruption of the courts by Executive interference.

In spite of all these objections and the further enlargement of the public debt it yet remains that in this time of desperate need of the unemployed and destitute it appears as a public duty to extend relief to those in dire need. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 201. (a) In order to increase employment by providing for useful public-works projects of the kind and character which the Federal Emergency Administrator of Public Works (herein called the "Administrator") has heretofore financed or aided in financing, pursuant to Title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, or the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until June 30, 1940, the sum of \$965,000,000, to be expended by such Administrator, subject to the approval of the President, for (1) the making of allotments to finance Federal projects, or (2) the making of loans or grants, or both, to States, Territories, possessions, political subdivisions, or other public bodies (herein called public agencies), or (3) the construction and leasing of projects, with or without the privilege of purchase, to any such public agencies.

(b) No funds appropriated under this title shall be allotted for any project which in the determination of the Administrator cannot be commenced prior to January 1, 1939, or the completion of which cannot be substantially accomplished prior to June 30, 1940.

(c) Under subsection (a) (1) of this section not to exceed \$100,000,000 shall be allotted to Federal agencies for Federal construction projects in continental United States outside the District of Columbia, and such projects shall be selected from among the following classes: (1) Projects heretofore authorized by law and for the acquisition of land for sites for such authorized projects; (2) projects for the enlargement, extension, or remodeling of existing Federal plants, institutions, or facilities; (3) projects for new hospitals and domiciliary facilities of the Veterans' Administration (including the acquisition of land for sites therefor) and any such allotments shall be available for the purposes and under the conditions specified in the appropriation for "Hospitals and domiciliary facilities" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1939; and (4) projects for new penal and correctional facilities under the Department of Justice, including the acquisition of land for sites therefor: *Provided*, That none of such allotments shall be made for military or naval purposes except for the housing of personnel or for storage of material, supplies, and equipment at existing establishments.

(d) No grant shall be made in excess of 45 percent of the cost of any non-Federal project, and no project shall be constructed for lease to any public agency unless the Administrator shall determine that the nonrecoverable portion of the cost of such project shall not exceed 45 percent of the cost thereof.

(e) In the event that, due to constitutional limitations, any State, Territory, possession, political subdivision or other public body shall be unable to participate by way of loan and grant in the benefits of this title, the Administrator, with the approval of the President, may advance moneys to any such public agency upon agreement by such public agency to pay back in annual installments, over a period of not to exceed 25 years, at least 55 percent of the amount so advanced with interest thereon for the period of amortization.

(f) Not more than \$750,000,000 of the funds appropriated under this title shall be used for grants, or for defraying the estimated nonrecoverable portion of the cost of projects constructed for lease to public agencies.

(g) Not more than \$11,000,000 of the appropriation in this title shall be available for administrative expenses of the Administration during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939; such amount and the amount made available in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1939, for administrative expenses for the Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works shall be

available for administrative expenses thereof during such fiscal year for the purposes and under the conditions set forth in such act for such Administration, except that the condition therein that such administrative expenses are in "connection with the liquidation of said Administration" is hereby rescinded and both amounts are hereby made available, in addition to the other purposes, for the purchase and exchange of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use in field work and in the District of Columbia in a total amount not to exceed \$75,000 but not more than \$1,500 thereof shall be so expended for such purchase and exchange for use in such District. And the Administrator shall reserve from the appropriation in this title an adequate amount for administrative expenses of the Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, for the completion of the activities of such Administration subject to authorization hereafter by annual appropriation acts for the utilization thereof.

(h) Not more than \$500,000,000 shall be used, from the moneys realized from the sale of securities acquired with funds made available by this title or with the proceeds of such securities for the making of further loans hereunder.

(i) No Federal construction project, except flood-control and water-conservation projects now under actual construction, shall be undertaken or prosecuted under the appropriation in this title unless and until there shall have been allocated and irrevocably set aside Federal funds sufficient for its completion; and no non-Federal project shall be undertaken or prosecuted under the funds made available by this title unless and until adequate provision has been or will be made for financing such part of the entire cost thereof as is not to be supplied from Federal funds.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I believe this important section ought to have at least 45 or 50 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM. I will compromise. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BACON: On page 21, line 19, after subsection (i), insert a new subsection as follows:

SUBSEC. (j). None of the funds appropriated in this act shall be expended on projects which would provide competition by Federal or public agencies with private business or enterprise.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply provides that no projects may be adopted which will place the Federal Government in competition with private business enterprises. This is a relief bill, and it is not a relief measure if you let the Federal Government establish projects which will put private enterprises out of business and thereby create unemployment. I submit that if any public body wishes to engage in some business it can go to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under the bill we passed a little while ago, and borrow 100 percent of the money required for that purpose. No public body ought to start in competition with a private enterprise and have a 45 percent gift or grant to start with. That is absolutely unfair competition, and it has no place in a relief bill. I sincerely hope that if the House believes the Government should not compete with its own citizens with the taxpayers' money, and particularly with a grant of 45 percent, the Members will vote for this amendment.

If the amendment is defeated it means that the majority party of the House of Representatives believes the Federal Government should compete with its own private citizens with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Under the gentleman's amendment, how would public buildings be constructed? You would be competing with private business.

Mr. BACON. A schoolhouse does not compete with private business.

Mr. RAMSPECK. But the construction is competitive.

Mr. BACON. This has nothing to do with construction. I say the project itself must not compete with private business or enterprise.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may state that a list was made of gentlemen seeking recognition at the time the limitation was placed on debate, and the time available will entitle each gentleman listed to 3 minutes. Without objection, recognition will be accorded for 3 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from New York is very far-reaching. I am just as anxious as the gentleman is to keep the Government from competing with private business, but if the gentleman's amendment carries you will find there can be no grants to municipalities or States or to a penal institution that wants to construct its own power plant. My State wants to increase the size of its power plant in the new penitentiary. Under this amendment it could not be done.

There are other improvements my State wants to make where the money is available to go ahead with the work, and you would deny my State to install power plants in connection with State institutions. If you will study this amendment you will understand how far-reaching it is. For instance, you could not repair or increase the power plants in any Government penal institution. I might vote for an amendment of this kind if it did not go so far.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call to the attention of the Committee a situation that I feel something should be done to correct.

In this bill you have, and very properly so, a provision for appropriations for public buildings. Scattered all over Washington, in many independent agencies and every Government department, is a building division. One of the objectives of the reorganization bill was to put them all under one head. Where are the provisions in this bill which will see the Public Works Administrator constructs the public buildings immediately and that their construction does not extend over a long period of time?

Mr. WOODRUM. There is a specific provision in the bill that construction must be started before January 1. It is a mandatory provision that the buildings must be started before January 1.

Mr. COCHRAN. Suppose you give a large amount of money to the Veterans' Administration to provide for construction work. The Veterans' Administration has a small building organization. Naturally they want to keep that organization working as long as they can. The result is they go along slowly with their construction work. Additional facilities are needed for veterans, an emergency exists in my city and many other localities. If the Procurement Division is called in they can help get this work started long before January. They have the organization set-up now, under the old law.

The Procurement Division at my request offered to put its force to work on the projects of the Veterans' Bureau so they could get going immediately and help labor at once, but the Veterans' Bureau would not accept the assistance. I feel provisions should be made in this bill so that someone would have authority to say, "If you cannot get this work started at once, call on the Procurement Division that has an organization that can get it started for you."

ADDITIONAL PENAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to see that the committee has included specific provision for the construction of additional penal and correctional institutions under the Department of Justice. The Federal prison system has been required to carry an ever-increasing load without being provided the necessary facilities. Congress is continually passing new Federal criminal legislation and broadening Federal jurisdiction without making provision for the incarceration of those convicted in Federal court.

I am told that the Federal prison population is today the highest it has ever been in the history of the country. The population of all the Federal penal institutions is now about 17,250; whereas, a year ago it was about 1,000 less, and 5 years ago it was 5,000 less than it is today. The result is

that almost all of the Federal prisons are now greatly overcrowded. The Leavenworth Penitentiary, for instance, which has a normal capacity of about 1,800, as I recall it, now has a population of slightly more than 3,000. The same thing is true at Atlanta and several of the other Federal penitentiaries. Also, the Department of Justice has never been able to turn back to the War Department the old Army disciplinary barracks at Leavenworth, which it took over during prohibition days. I notice, moreover, in the hearings on the Justice bill that there had been an increase of nearly 40 percent in the commitments to the Federal institutions during the last 3 years for such crimes as bank robbery, kidnapping, and extortion. The building of Federal prisons has not kept pace with the tendency to shift crime control to the Federal Government. Something needs to be done very shortly to relieve the serious situation facing the prison system.

I understand that the Prison Bureau has submitted to Congress statements showing that their estimated needs for new prison construction during the next 2 years total approximately \$15,000,000. I realize that there are many desirable Federal-construction projects which the P. W. A. will have to consider when allocating these funds, but few of them will be more important than providing additional facilities for the prison system. We must find some way to take care of the increasing Federal-prison population; and if it is not done under the terms of this bill, it will have to be done out of regular appropriations. You can be certain that there will be no waste of Federal money or construction of buildings not absolutely necessary if it is used to add to our prison facilities.

Again I congratulate the committee for giving consideration to this problem and urge those in charge of the allocation of this money to review the report of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons and the testimony which has been submitted to Congress by him on the need for additions to the prison system and give their needs every consideration. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UMSTEAD: On page 19, after line 18, strike out all of subsection (e).

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered strikes from the bill subsection (e) at the bottom of page 19, which reads as follows:

In the event that, due to constitutional limitations, any State, Territory, possession, political subdivision, or other public body shall be unable to participate by way of loan and grant in the benefits of this title, the Administrator, with the approval of the President, may advance moneys to any such public agency upon agreement by such public agency to pay back in annual installments, over a period of not to exceed 25 years, at least 55 percent of the amount so advanced with interest thereon for the period of amortization.

I offer this amendment reluctantly because I am a member of the committee from which this bill has been reported. I offered it in the committee and I do so now in order that the record may be kept straight. The section which I seek to strike from this bill, in my judgment, is a legislative device for the purpose of inviting, inducing, and seducing the State governments and local units of government to violate the fundamental law of the commonwealths of this country.

In the 3 minutes to which I am limited I cannot do much more than to place upon the conscience of every man within the hearing of my voice the rather serious responsibility of inviting the local units of Government and every official thereof in the several States of the Union to violate their own constitutional limitations. It was explained to the Committee as being a lease-purchase proposition, whereby the Federal Government could build a project if the State or local unit had reached its constitutional limitation upon the incurrence of debt; bear all of the cost and lease the finished work to the officials of State or local units of government

under a lease-purchase contract which, if you please, is just as much a violation of State constitutional limitations as would be a straight out unauthorized loan.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UMSTEAD. Pardon me; not now.

What will you do when the Federal Government builds a street in the heart of a city and leases it on a sales contract-purchase plan to the city in which it is built? You know the payments will not be made. The preceding paragraph requires the Administrator to find as a fact that 55 percent can and will be returned to the Federal Government. Such a requirement, in the face of subsection (e), is a ridiculous and absurd proposition because the officials of a town or of a county or of a State entering into an unlawful contract would have no legal means of binding their successors to carry out and fulfill that contract.

I call upon the Members of this House, upon the ground of good morals and legislative decency, to strike this section from the bill and not tear down the last barrier of local government and the sanctity of State laws. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the afternoon I discussed the very amendment that has been offered by my friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], I alluded at that time to the fact that tomorrow will be the sixty-eighth anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of the State of Illinois. It contains a debt limitation. It is couched in language which says that in no manner and for no purpose shall county, city, township, or school district officials incur a debt greater than 5 percent of the taxable value. It uses the language "in no manner and for no purpose."

Now, there comes a provision in the pending bill which seeks to torpedo the constitution of my State like it would the constitutions of 80 percent of the other States, and thereby engage in a kind of circumventing device through agreement or through lease with the Administrator of the Public Works Administration.

I would not care to vote for that. It looks a little unmoral to me. It looks like impairing the collective conscience of the country when we do it, and I should be very reluctant when this congressional session adjourns pretty soon to go back to my people and go on the hustings this summer and this fall and have to confess publicly to them that without some effort to have it deleted from the bill, I voted and sustained a proposition that deliberately flouted the constitution and the expressed will of the people when they ratified that constitution in 1868. Eighty percent of you gentlemen are in the same identical fix, and my friend from North Carolina was not stretching the point too much when he said he was charging your conscience when you come to vote on the amendment to eliminate and delete from this bill paragraph (e) which is the subject of the pending amendment.

I sincerely hope the amendment will be supported and agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Furthermore, what obligation is there on the part of a county or a city or a town that obtains a loan by an ultra vires act with respect to their power to do so, to pay back such loan?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is none; and in the meantime we simply prejudice a project which is tied up with various legal questions and legal fees, as anyone who has served on a board of local improvements well knows. I, for one, do not want to be a party to that kind of procedure. I therefore hope the amendment of my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, will be supported and adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOODRUM) there were—ayes 77, noes 63.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. WOODRUM and Mr. UMSTEAD to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 86, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 18, line 19, strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert "\$185,142,456".

On page 18, line 23, strike out the words "heretofore".

On page 19, line 11, after the word "storage", insert "or operation".

On page 19, line 12, after the word "establishments", strike out the period and insert a colon and the following language: "Provided, That of said sum, \$85,142,456 is hereby allocated to the War Department to be expended by and under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of War for the construction, rehabilitation, and improvement of housing and hospitalization facilities, utilities, storage, and operation facilities at Army posts in the order of their priority as established by the Secretary of War".

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not have an Army post in my district, not even a National Guard armory. This amendment does not increase this appropriation in the least. It merely allocates to the War Department a sum additional to that included in the bill for Federal projects. It is my purpose by this amendment to undertake to remove from the Army of the United States the slums, and to take care of the underprivileged, you might say, private soldiers who are living in shacks in hundreds of posts throughout the country and receiving \$21 a month for their services. The amendment will provide a fund that will take care of obligations that this Congress has had imposed upon it by the Constitution.

The first thing in the Constitution in Article I, subsection 8, is a direction to the Congress to provide and maintain an army and navy for the common defense. Unless this money is allocated now, we will be called upon in years to come to appropriate it in order to rehabilitate these army camps that are in desperate condition. This is a program of Federal expenditure upon durable items of value to the Federal Government. These items are all necessary at this time, and they would be requested in future estimates for appropriations as fast as budgetary conditions would permit. They are nonrecurrent, and thus are a definite saving in future appropriations. They furnish employment both on the job and to industry, particularly to those industries manufacturing building material. The War Department has the organization now to set the funds to work. It has many of the plans ready. Much of the work can be started within 30 days, and it is believed that all of the program can be completed within 1 year. The distribution is country-wide and affords relief in many localities.

Millions of dollars of army equipment and material, including airplanes now inadequately sheltered or serviced will be better protected. It will be a great step in affording decent housing to men who will wear the uniform of the United States for years to come—a great uplifting step for the morals and the morale of the Army.

My purpose in presenting this is to save money for the Government, and while we are spending this four and a half billion dollars I want to see some of it expended for the men who wear the uniform and carry the flag. The annual cost of maintenance alone on temporary buildings constructed during the World War amounts to 50 percent of their commercial value.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. If it is not done by your amendment, what are the chances of its being appropriated and the matter being taken care of in a later bill?

Mr. MAY. I do not know what the chances are. If we spend all of this I doubt if we would get any more very soon. If we should be so unfortunate as to get into war we would be immediately under the necessity of erecting new buildings at wartime prices.

LXXXIII—430

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. MAY. Last year the Military Affairs Committee after careful consideration and long study reported out a bill for Army construction amounting to \$162,000,000. In the retrenchment program of last year, that amount was cut down, and an appropriation bill of only \$25,000,000 passed the Congress. We need more accommodations for the Army of the United States. In the hearings on the deficiency appropriation bill it is shown that the Army of the United States has been raised from 118,000 men a few years ago to a force of 165,000 men now. In addition to that, we have increased the air force of the country more than 7,000. It is shown by the hearings that the barracks in which the soldiers are housed now are mainly those war cantonments built in 1917. The hearings show that it costs annually about 25 to 50 percent of the value of those old buildings to maintain them.

Mr. Chairman, if we give the Army the quarters the soldiers need it will be carrying out the President's program of giving work and jobs to the building trades. We have been trying to stimulate the heavy industries of the country. If you allow this program of increased barracks and facilities for the Army you will be scattering over the whole United States a program that will give this desired stimulation.

The money spent on the barracks under this Works Program will save appropriations in the years to come for these purposes. This is a splendid opportunity to give the Army of the United States approximately the housing facilities that it needs and at the same time carry out this building program for the country as a whole.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I hope you understand that if you vote for this amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky that you take \$85,000,000 that would otherwise go to your P. W. A. projects for schools, bridges, or streets and freeze it for Army posts. I do not imagine you want to do that.

We have in this bill a very liberal provision. We have provided that not exceeding \$100,000,000 of these funds may be allocated for Federal projects which have heretofore been authorized by Congress; and that is as far as you ought to go. You ought not to turn any agency loose to build projects that have not been passed upon by the Congress.

Something like \$20,000,000 of Army projects have been approved by the Congress. These projects will be eligible for consideration by the President in allocating funds to Federal projects. If, however, you adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky you not only take \$85,000,000 from your other projects and freeze it for Army projects but you take it away from projects you have authorized. Instead of this being a work relief program it will turn into a national defense program.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman mean to say that with Army posts building houses all over this country in 48 different States it will not help business and industry and provide employment?

Mr. WOODRUM. I think that would be of some help. I must confess I feel sympathetic toward the gentleman's proposition. He knows I have stood here and fought for things with him; but I hope you will go along with the committee and not tie up this vast amount of funds in this way.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY) there were—ayes 53, noes 86.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON: Page 18, line 24, after the word "project" add the following: "priority being hereby given to those projects mentioned in Public, No. 394, Seventy-fifth Congress, and situated in continental United States."

Mr. THOMASON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I anticipated the result of the last vote that was cast on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky. The truth is I find myself pretty well in accord with the views expressed by the gentleman from Virginia regarding the principle involved. I was pleased to note that the gentleman from Virginia stated that there are approximately \$20,000,000 in authorizations already in the law for new Army construction and that these projects are all eligible. My amendment seeks to make this a little stronger than just saying they are eligible, and gives these projects a priority status.

I remind the Members that at the last session of Congress after the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I happen to be chairman, gave several months of careful consideration to Army housing, and after the Budget had approved it, and after the Committee on Military Affairs had unanimously adopted it, this House, without a dissenting voice, passed the bill authorizing new construction at about 40 of the posts in continental United States.

That bill passed the Senate without opposition and is now the law and authorizes new construction in continental United States the sum of \$19,217,356. May I add that the War Department advises me the plans and specifications for every one of the projects covered by that act have been prepared and bids could be asked for tomorrow. This means work for every State in the Union. It means the sale of large quantities of material. It means the improvement of Army posts that are in a dilapidated and disgraceful condition.

If you want to give immediate employment to thousands of men, if you want to put these Army posts in proper condition, there is nothing to do but adopt the amendment I have offered in order that there may be some priority under this particular section. It does not increase the appropriation covered by section C one single cent. It does not take one single penny away from the schools, bridges, hospitals, and other things that have been mentioned. The only thing it does is to make it certain that this needed improvement can start at once and our Army be properly housed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would establish a priority for Army projects. That is, it would put Army projects and Army posts above veterans' hospitals, above fish hatcheries, above Coast Guard stations, and above every other sort of Federal project that might be entitled to consideration under this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISH: Page 18, lines 5 and 6, after the word "Administrator" strike out "subject to the approval of the President."

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, what has happened to those brave warriors who a week ago announced through the press that they proposed to earmark all these relief and public works appropriations? What has happened to them? They have gone with the emergency wind.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I cannot yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. This provision has always been in the law.

Mr. FISH. I am talking about all of these appropriations. Those happy warriors remind me, Mr. Chairman, of the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Montana who marched bravely up the hill to Jersey City and then marched back down again a little more rapidly. [Laughter and applause.]

The passage of this bill conferring upon the President the control over the expenditure of \$4,000,000,000 undoes the good work accomplished by the American people in defeating the reorganization bill. They opposed that bill because they did not believe in granting any additional power to the President to establish a one-man or super government. This bill confers 10 times as much power on the President as the reorganization bill. In a few minutes it is utterly impossible to give the reasons why I propose to vote against this further grant of power involving four billions. May I say that I intend to vote for the motion to recommit in order to turn the relief money over to the States for distribution on a nonpartisan basis. On the final passage of the bill I expect to vote against it for one main, fundamental reason. I do not want to stultify myself by surrendering, abdicating, and delegating away control of the purse strings. That is the main reason for the existence of the Congress. If you vote away that constitutional power over appropriations there is nothing left. That is the main legislative power of the Congress and when you delegate away control of the purse strings to the President, we will have no more legislative power left than Ghandi has clothing.

Mr. Chairman, I know there is nothing I may say to stop the steam roller. It is all oiled up for political purposes. It is ready to crush all opposition and prime the election pump, but in doing so you are not merely destroying minority rights, you are destroying the fundamental rights and privileges of this House; you are surrendering control over the purse strings and that responsibility rests upon the majority party for undermining representative and constitutional government in the United States. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEWIS of Colorado: Page 19, line 10, after the word "housing" insert "or hospitalization."

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this is purely a clarifying amendment. A number of Members of the Appropriations Committee have assured me they believe that the expression "housing of personnel" includes "hospitalization of personnel" and that such was their intention. But there may be some doubt. I submit therefore that this is simply a clarifying amendment and that this amendment should be adopted to place the matter beyond any doubt or question.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BIERMANN: Page 18, line 26, beginning with "(3)" strike all down to and including the semicolon in line 6, page 19.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, the effect of my amendment will be to strike out the appropriation for new veterans' hospitals. I know it is the inclination of Members to vote for this clause because they think they are doing a service to the veterans. The fact, is as many of you veterans know, they are doing a disservice to the veterans.

We should stop adding to the general hospital facilities for veterans. We should give them abundant special hos-

pital facilities, like cancer hospitals, tubercular hospitals, and mental hospitals. The general hospital facilities of communities in which the veterans live should be utilized fully before we appropriate more money for general hospitals for veterans.

When I offer this amendment I am proposing a service not only to the pocketbook of Uncle Sam but to the veterans themselves and to the multitude of communities in the United States where the churches or the communities themselves or some other public-spirited bodies maintain local hospitals. My contention is that if we ever do the right thing regarding general hospitalization for veterans we will hospitalize the veteran in his own home town, where he can pick out his own doctor and his own nurse and can have his family and his friends visit him. He cannot do that if we continue to build general hospitals and add new hospital facilities of a general nature so the veterans will be dragged away from their own homes to hospitals 200 miles away, where they cannot be visited by their own friends and families, and where they go under the care of doctors and nurses who never saw them before.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLER. Is it good medical practice to have a man visited all the time when he is sick? I thought hospitals kept people away from him.

Mr. BIERMANN. I am not a doctor, and I cannot answer that question.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIERMANN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. Would the gentleman's amendment carry more funds for special hospitals?

Mr. BIERMANN. It would eliminate this provision from the bill entirely. It would save relief money for other purposes. There is another appropriation bill that provides for veterans' hospitals. My effort is to point out how mistaken is the idea that the more money you vote for veterans' hospitals the more kindness you are showing the veterans. You are not only hurting the veteran but you are hurting the community from which the veteran comes.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona. I would be willing to look toward minimizing general hospitalization, if that means voting for more special hospitals or enlarging existing facilities with special climatic conditions such as the hospital at Tucson.

Mr. BIERMANN. Vote for this amendment and make a start in that direction.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 17, line 19, down to page 21, line 18, strike out all of section 201.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to strike the P. W. A. out of the bill. It is not an item for relief and we all realize it. It is not an item for the relief of unemployment but something that will not put people to work in any substantial number prior to the 1st of January.

There is a program on the part of certain dreamers to have the United States spend \$3,000,000,000 a year over a period of 10 years. This is a part of that program. It is sponsored by the National Resources Board and appears in the blue book I have on the top of the desk over there. This means \$30,000,000,000 more debt and it means financial disaster to America. Let us put the brakes on while we can. Regardless of how much we may like to have these projects in our territory, let us have patriotism enough to turn this program down and stop the construction of projects we cannot afford and whose building will run us deeper and deeper into debt and our localities deeper and deeper into debt without providing relief at all.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 28, noes 91.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 202. The Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works is hereby continued to the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and is hereby authorized to continue to perform all functions which it is authorized to perform at the date of enactment hereof. All provisions of law existing on the date of enactment hereof, and relating to the availability of funds for carrying out any of the functions of such Administration, are hereby continued to the end of such fiscal year, except that the date specified in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, as amended by section 201 of the Public Works Extension Act of 1937, prior to which, in the determination of the Administrator, projects for which moneys made available by such act were authorized to be granted, can be substantially completed is hereby changed from "July 1, 1939" to "July 1, 1940."

SEC. 203. That portion of section 203 of the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937 which reads as follows is hereby repealed: "and after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution no allotment shall be made by the Administrator for any project the application for which has not been approved by the examining divisions of the Administration prior to such date."

SEC. 204. Section 206 of the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 206. No new applications for loans or grants for non-Federal projects shall be received or considered by the Administration after August 31, 1938: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to applications amendatory of applications for projects received prior to August 31, 1938, and such applications shall be confined to projects which, in the determination of the Administrator, can be started and completed within the time limits specified in section 201 (b) hereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 22, line 26, strike out the word "hereof" and insert "of the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the further committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 22, line 19, strike out the words "or considered."

In line 20, strike out "August 31" and insert in lieu thereof "September 30."

In line 22, strike out "August 31" and insert "October 1."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 205. This title may be cited as the "Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938".

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman from Virginia whether or not it is the intention of the committee to offer an amendment on rural electrification?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; it is.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will that amendment be offered to the last title?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—FEDERAL PUBLIC BUILDINGS

SEC. 301. Construction of Public Buildings Outside the District of Columbia: The total amount authorized to be appropriated for the 3-year program for the acquisition of sites and construction of public buildings by the paragraph under the caption "Emergency Construction of Public Buildings Outside the District of Columbia", contained in the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1937, approved August 25, 1937 (50 Stat. 773), is hereby increased from \$70,000,000 to \$130,000,000. All applicable provisions and authority of such paragraph shall be operative with respect to the enlarged authorization provided in this title except that the list from which projects, including the sites therefor, are to be selected by the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Treasury acting jointly shall be the revision, dated April 25, 1938, of House Report No. 1879, Seventy-third Congress. Toward such increased program there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$25,000,000, of which not to exceed \$500,000 may be utilized as an

addition to the fund specified in such paragraph in such act for the augmentation of the limits of cost of selected projects in amounts not exceeding 10 percent of such limits of cost. The appropriations heretofore made under the authority of such paragraph, together with the appropriation in this title, shall be consolidated into a single fund and be available toward the consummation of the entire authorized program.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. Is it under this section that it is contemplated, as I have read, although I have not been officially so informed, that one or more public buildings are to be erected in every congressional district in the Union?

Mr. WOODRUM. It is not just exactly as the gentleman has stated it. The purpose is to enlarge the program for Federal public buildings by the sum of \$60,000,000. The Procurement Division has testified before the committee that with this additional fund they can take care of certain major projects which are very much needed in large areas of the country and, in addition, be able to reach out for smaller projects in congressional districts where there are projects eligible under the rule under which they operate.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Can the gentleman state to the House whether in his judgment—I suppose he cannot give a final opinion—actually under this section we are going to see the spectacle of one or more Federal buildings put up in every congressional district in the Union?

Mr. WOODRUM. I cannot subscribe to the gentleman's appellation of "spectacle."

My friend will recall the fact that the present method of erecting Federal public buildings was inaugurated under the administration, I believe, of Mr. Coolidge, a Republican administration, many years ago when we got away from the old "pork barrel" method and established an interdepartmental committee composed of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General that surveyed the building needs of the Government and made up an eligible list of places where there was economic justification for the construction of public buildings when we could get to it and had the funds. Under preceding administrations we have from time to time appropriated lump sums that have been applied to this program of constructing utilitarian buildings in this country. There are now some 2,700 projects, and my friend and colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] has 14 communities in his district that are eligible for public buildings. Some districts have no places where they need Federal housing facilities. The thought of the committee was that if we are going to have construction of Federal public buildings, this would be a good way to spread the building activities out in the country and at the same time accomplish the purpose of the bill, which is to help the building industry and help trade generally.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The general purpose, too, being to spread the money where it will do the most good.

Mr. WOODRUM. That is the purpose.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am rather amazed, in view of the prospect of the First Congressional District of New York, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] intends to vote against the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM. I am surprised at that. I thought the gentleman would vote for the bill.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. BACON. Although I have more eligible projects in my district than in any other congressional district in the United States, the gentleman will agree that I voted against this title in committee.

Mr. WOODRUM. I do that, but I am also happy in the thought that the gentleman voted against it knowing he would get his Federal buildings. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania: On page 24, after line 4, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 301 (a). No one shall be denied employment under the provisions of this act because he is not registered on the relief rolls of any State."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane. We have passed that section of the bill.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. The amendment would apply to the entire bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WARREN). However, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has offered the amendment to this particular title. The amendment is not germane to this title, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered this pro forma amendment to pay a well-deserved tribute to one of the finest men in the Federal service. I refer to that fine gentleman, Mr. Smith Purdum, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, who has charge of the erection of public buildings by the Federal Government for postal quarters. [Applause.] Mr. Purdum is a service employee, one who started in the Postal Service many years ago and who by strict honesty and devotion to the Department has been rewarded to the fine position of responsibility he occupies today. I have never heard one word of reproach against Mr. Purdum and the manner in which he conducts the administration of his duties. Not one word of waste or extravagance or inefficiency, but on the other hand, those who have had to contact him will bear witness to his efficiency and particularly to his fine spirit of willingness to cooperate and in the expeditious manner in which all matters brought to his attention are acted upon.

To know Mr. Purdum is to love and respect him. He has surrounded himself with able, hard-working assistants and men and women whom it is a pleasure to contact, as many of us must frequently do. He has saved considerable sums of money to the Post Office Department by applying businesslike methods in the performance of his work. There is no scandal as to leases and waste, but on the other hand only praise and commendation for this Department. In our Federal building program, particularly in the erection of post-office buildings, our Government has caused to be saved each year about \$2,000,000, and in the erection of additional buildings will not only add additional savings but increase efficiency in what I believe to be the greatest service organization in all the world, the Post Office Department. Led by a fine, fearless, competent Postmaster General, the citizens of our country are beginning to appreciate just what we make possible; and I doubt very much if there is any activity of the Government that meets with more generous approval than the erection of Federal buildings for postal service, particularly in offices of the first and second class. I also want to commend the Department for the type of buildings they have erected. Not palaces, or ornamental structures for show, but on the other hand the buildings that have been erected have had efficiency and adequacy as their objective.

When I see some of the buildings that were erected in small towns years ago, the amount of money that was spent for outside decorations and show, I feel that what Mr. Purdum and his assistants have recommended should deserve all the encouragement that we can give. I am pleased to support this provision of the bill, for I believe it to be something permanent and worth while. It not only meets the present economic need for employment, but adds to the permanent wealth of the Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I wish to say just a few words in support of title III—Federal public buildings.

This title provides for a direct appropriation of \$25,000,000 to be used for the immediate construction of Federal buildings. In addition, there is provided a contract authorization for \$35,000,000 making a total obligation of \$60,000,000. The provisions of title III expand the 3-year public-building program from the \$70,000,000 authorized in a previous session of Congress to \$130,000,000.

Just what does this mean? Beginning on page 294 and running through page 336 of the hearings on this bill there

appears a list of authorized but eligible public-building projects, the construction of which is sorely needed.

Both as a member of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and as one interested in the development of postal services as well as community service I can assure you that this expanded building program is in the public interest. There is a real need for new or improved post-office buildings throughout the country. The efficiency of our Postal Service can be no better than the buildings and equipment that we provide for those who carry the mail.

We are embarking on a gigantic drive to put men back to work. In conducting this drive we should bear in mind Uncle Sam's needs which in this case are also the individual needs of a great many of our cities. In erecting much needed post office and courthouse buildings and in providing for the alteration and modernization of buildings now in use we accomplish three of the primary objectives of this recovery and works program.

First. We put men back to work. Jobs are created in a normal way. The building of these post offices creates jobs all along the line. Not only are men employed on the actual project but there is also created a long line of other jobs due to the increased demand for steel, hardware, cement, plaster, brick, glass, and all of the thousand and one necessities of such buildings.

Second. By building needed public buildings in all parts of the country there is a general and equitable distribution of this work. The effect of this program will be felt all over the country. It does not provide a lopsided development of boom in one section of the country and bust in others.

Third. This program, when completed, will not only supply much-needed postal facilities but will also provide permanent quarters for Federal activities now housed in privately owned space and upon which we pay an annual toll of rents. These are buildings of real public worth. To a large extent they are self-liquidating through the savings effected in payment of rent on quarters now leased by the Government. Each of these buildings represents not only jobs for those now unemployed but also provides a lasting implement of public service.

Before I close I want to say just a few words about a group of men whose conscientious day-by-day work has established the basis for this building program. Most of you are familiar with our Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Purdum, and know the fine work that he so ably carried on. Few people fully realize the great savings that are effected for our Government by the good business judgment of Smith W. Purdum. In the preparation of these plans, just as in the preparation of many of the economies effected by the Post Office Department under this administration, the work has been carried on by Smith W. Purdum and our genial and beloved Postmaster General, James A. Farley. This title of the bill, one of the best in the entire measure, owes its existence not only to our Postmaster General, Mr. Farley, and to the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, Mr. Purdum, but also to the untiring efforts and efficiency of our own chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, Mr. JIM MEAD. I have every confidence that this title will be enacted. [Applause.]

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this pro forma amendment not for the purpose of trespassing on the time of the House, as I recognize the desire to complete consideration of this legislation within the next few minutes. I do rise however, to join in enlarging the base of appraisal of the activities of the Honorable Smith W. Purdum, Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, so very eloquently contributed by my colleagues of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, Mr. HAINES, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LUCKEY of Nebraska.

Mr. Purdum has been in the service of the Post Office Department for the past 40 years. He is one of the most efficient, conscientious employees in the service of the Government. In June 1934, he was selected by Postmaster James A. Farley to be the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General. He then became a member of the Interdepartmental Committee on Public Buildings. To a great extent he has had the re-

sponsibility of supervising the enormous construction program conducted by the Post Office Department and the Treasury Department.

In the erection of several hundred post-office buildings throughout the country approximately \$60,000,000, has been spent, providing necessary increased space and needed additional facilities. To the execution of this program Mr. Purdum has given painstaking effort, always protecting the interest of his Government, and the localities to be served. And added to this accomplishment were the duties and responsibilities of his office as Fourth Assistant Postmaster General.

Not so long ago conditions bordering on a national scandal were prevalent in the Post Office Department, due to the negligent method of leasing and renting space to house postal facilities. With the advent of this administration tremendous progress has been made in the reduction of rentals for space in buildings in localities where the Government owns no such property. It is significant to remark that during the former administration these rentals reached the high mark of \$18,000,000 per year. At the present time the total aggregate is \$11,350,000 thereby effecting a saving of \$6,650,000. Credit for this saving in large part is due to the strict attention to detail and careful supervision exercised by the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General. I know him to be a modest individual who cares little for eulogies, and only asks for the opportunity to continue as a valiant and loyal public servant. Postmaster General Farley, who in my opinion will go down in history as the greatest Postmaster General this country ever had, can well be proud of the record of his able assistant.

I am sure the members of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee of the House, and I judge by the applause registered on this floor today by the Members of the House as a whole, express complete approval of the splendid service rendered by Smith W. Purdum to the Nation. I wish for him a long life and much happiness. I submit this tribute to him not as a Member of the Congress of the United States, but as a humble citizen who believes in giving praise to an untiring public servant during his lifetime.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: Page 24, line 4, after the period, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 301. (a) The administration of this act shall be carried out by the several and respective States of the United States of America to which the moneys appropriated by this act shall be allocated by the President of the United States of America pro rata according to the population of each, the machinery of administration in each State to be established by the Governors of said States."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order?

Mr. WOODRUM. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. In the opinion of the Chair the amendment is not germane and the Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 302. This title may be cited as the "Federal Public Buildings Appropriation Act of 1938."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM: On page 24, after line 6, insert a new title as follows:

"TITLE IV—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION LOANS"

"SEC. 401. The act entitled 'An act to provide for rural electrification, and for other purposes', approved May 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1363), is hereby amended as follows: (a) By inserting in subsection (a) of section 3 thereof immediately following the date 'June 30, 1937' the phrase 'and \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939' and (b) by striking out the date 'June 30, 1937', appearing at the end of subsection (e) of such section 3 and inserting in lieu thereof the date 'June 30, 1939'."

"SEC. 402. This title may be cited as the 'Rural Electrification Act of 1938.'"

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, this will take a very few minutes and I ask the attention of the Committee. Under the general law we have provided for the Rural Electrification Administration \$40,000,000 for loans for the next year, which is the full amount now authorized by law. There has been a great interest, a great demand for additional funds for rural electrification. They now have on hand \$90,000,000 worth of applications. The amendment which I have offered as a new title authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to let the Rural Electrification Administration have an additional sum of \$60,000,000, which gives them \$100,000,000 in loans for rural electrification, more than an ample amount to take care of the applications on hand. I have discussed the matter with many gentlemen and I hope very much that it will be satisfactory and that the committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. RAYBURN. I may say that being one of the co-authors of the Rural Electrification Act, it provided an authorization of \$420,000,000 over a period of 9 years, being \$40,000,000 a year. The committees of the House and Senate have already met the \$40,000,000. There are on file in the Rural Electrification Administration applications for \$90,000,000. A great deal of misinformation has gone out with respect to this matter, to the effect that \$90,000,000 of applications have been approved. That is not true. Is that correct?

Mr. WOODRUM. That is correct.

Mr. RAYBURN. It may be that not more than \$50,000,000 or \$60,000,000 or \$70,000,000 may be approved, but in order that in addition to the \$40,000,000 every community in the land that has made application may have a chance, the committee has generously offered an amendment authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend to the Rural Electrification Administration \$60,000,000 additional, and if all applications on hand were approved, even then they would have an additional \$10,000,000 to take care of contingencies.

Mr. WOODRUM. This amendment does not in any way increase the total amount of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: Line 7 of the amendment just offered, strike out "\$60,000,000" and insert "\$100,000,000."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Virginia says, this does not take one dollar from any other appropriation. It does not take one dollar from the W. P. A. fund or from the P. W. A. fund; it merely raises the authorization which the R. F. C. may advance to the R. E. A. on applications that are not only approved by the R. E. A. but must be approved by the President of the United States.

We have already applications totaling \$90,000,000. Unless this amendment is adopted we will have only \$10,000,000 for applications that may come in during the coming year. If applications are not filed and approved the money will not be expended, it will not cost one dollar; but I am here to tell you that whenever the farmers know that this authorization has been made, applications will swarm in here from almost every district in the United States. So I hope you will adopt this amendment in order to give us a reasonable amount for the Rural Electrification Administration for the coming year. None of this money will be expended except upon the approval of the R. E. A. and of the President of the United States. This only increases the amount by \$40,000,000, and the Rural Electrification Administration informs me they will need every dollar of it before the end of the year.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we are considering a further expenditure of approximately \$6,000,000,000 that will be added to the enormous debt of this country. This bill is called a recovery bill. I hope it will

do for this country what its proponents say will be accomplished by its passage.

I am criticizing the bill this afternoon particularly because of the manner in which it has been presented to us. As I have just said, this measure provides for the expenditure of \$6,000,000,000. Less than one-third of it is for relief. The remainder is for so-called pump-priming. I am in favor of, and want to support a measure which will provide work and care for the twelve to fifteen millions of our people who are so unfortunate as to be unable to secure jobs today. I believe it is the duty of the Government and the communities to see, so far as possible, that these people are reasonably cared for until such time as they may be able to secure work in private employment. The worst criticism against this democratic form of government of ours, is the fact that after years of experience, it has been unable to even begin to solve the unemployment problem.

I am willing to support the administration's recommendation for approximately one and one-half billion dollars for relief purposes—but I do want this money distributed among, and paid to the people who need it, and to whom it belongs. Furthermore, I insist that these funds be used for worthy projects—things that are really worth while. If there are any funds which should be carefully and economically administered, it is the fund which is appropriated for the relief of those people who have not been able to secure jobs whereby they may earn a livelihood for their families and themselves.

If it were not for the enormous debt into which this country has been plunged, there might be some possible excuse for the pump-priming features of this measure; but I do not believe that these so-called pump-priming features are, in the long run, for the best interests of this country. After all, the debt of this country is the debt of every man, woman, and child who lives within its borders.

I believe the unemployed worker who is willing to help himself should be helped. Then we should take care of those who are not able and will not be able to take care of themselves. However, it seems to me that the committee in charge of this bill, if it really wanted to be fair to the membership of this House, would give us a chance to vote on the relief bill; and then separately and apart, the pump-priming bill could be brought on the floor and we could vote on the merits of that measure, separate and distinct from the relief bill. If this House determined that a pump-priming bill is necessary, then it could support such a measure. If not, it could be voted down.

As the matter is presented now—we are put in the position of being required to vote for the entire bill, whereby we expend approximately \$6,000,000,000, less than one-third of which will be used for relief. In other words, we must take it all, or none.

If we could get to a place where we were willing to quit wasting public funds, prosperity, to some extent, might begin to be restored. Let us quit building battleships that cost fabulous sums. Let us quit scaring everybody who wants to invest money in legitimate business. Let us begin to reduce expenses to correspond to the income collected. Let us put our Government on a business basis.

In other words, let us provide a fair, reasonable, and adequate relief program. Administer it just as economically as possible. Give every man and woman who is willing to do so a chance to help himself. Let us begin to restore the confidence of the people in their Government, and of the Government in the people. Let us try to bring about a realization that all classes and all creeds, men in all walks of life, including industry and capital, labor and agriculture, are dependent upon each other, and upon the prosperity of the one depends largely the success of the other.

My appeal this afternoon is to appropriate a fair and adequate sum of money that will provide labor and sustenance for the millions of people who are out of jobs and unable to care for themselves. Then administer this fund as economically as possible, without political favor. See that every dol-

lar of the taxpayers' money goes to the person who needs it, and to whom it belongs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and there were on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN)—ayes 73, noes 90.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. RANKIN and Mr. WOODRUM.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 124, noes 118.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 1, line 10, of the proposed additional title IV, after the date, June 30, 1939, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "and (C) by inserting immediately following the last sentence of said subsection (a) the following sentence: 'From the funds made available to the Administrator by reason of loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, as herein authorized, the Administrator may expend an amount not to exceed 4 per centum thereof for administrative expenses.'"

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this merely allows 4 per cent for administrative expenses of the R. E. A. You will notice all through the bill 5 per cent has been allowed for governmental agencies. It is necessary for the R. E. A. to have funds if it is to carry on its work. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, it has been the custom of the Congress to require administrative agencies to come to Congress for their administrative expenses, and it should be required in this case. The lending of this additional amount of money ought not to require any additional administrative expense or, if so, a very small amount, but whatever it takes certainly they should be required to come to the Budget and to the Appropriations Committee, which they can do on the deficiency bill which comes up next week for such additional administrative expenses as they should need.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. TABER. This whole thing takes \$100,000,000 more out of the Treasury. Did anybody go to the Budget for that?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs to the committee amendment as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOODRUM) there were—ayes 51, noes 94.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. WOODRUM and Mr. RANKIN to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 126, noes 119.

So the committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania: Page 24, after title IV, add a new title V as follows:

"Sec. 1. No one shall be denied employment under the provisions of this act because he is not registered on the relief rolls of any State."

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take any time to discuss this amendment because the very statement of the practice of requiring men to be on the relief roll in order to get employment is its own condemnation. You can do something for all the people of this country by adopting my amendment.

Mr. BIERMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BIERMANN. I sympathize with the gentleman's amendment, but how are you going to select these people if you do not take them off the relief rolls?

Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania. They may be selected by men out of employment. The test should be unemployment, not relief.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAY].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WARREN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 679) making appropriations for work relief, relief, and otherwise to increase employment by providing loans and grants for public-works projects, pursuant to House Resolution 497, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments agreed to in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and amendments to final passage.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Jones amendment and on the Woodrum amendment adding the title covering rural electrification.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: Page 10, line 10, after the period, insert "farmers in actual need of work but who are not on relief rolls shall have the same eligibility for employment on projects in rural areas as persons on such rolls."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOODRUM), there were—ayes 204, noes 110.

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM: On page 24, after line 6, insert a new title as follows:

"TITLE IV—RURAL ELECTRIFICATION LOANS

"Sec. 401. The act entitled 'An act to provide for rural electrification, and for other purposes,' approved May 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1363), is hereby amended as follows: (a) By inserting in subsection (a) of section 3 thereof immediately following the date 'June 30, 1937' the phrase 'and \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939' and (b) by striking out the date 'June 30, 1939' and (c) by striking out the date 'June 30, 1937' appearing at the end of subsection (e) of such section 3 and inserting in lieu thereof the date 'June 30, 1939.'"

"Sec. 402. This title may be cited as the 'Rural Electrification Act of 1938.'"

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 260, nays 139, answered "present" 1, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

YEAS—260

Aleshire	Atkinson	Brown	Chandler
Allen, Del.	Bell	Buck	Chapman
Allen, Ill.	Bernard	Buckler, Minn.	Citron
Allen, La.	Biermann	Burch	Clark, Idaho
Allen, Pa.	Bigelow	Burdick	Clark, N. C.
Amie	Blinderup	Caldwell	Claypool
Anderson, Mo.	Boileau	Cannon, Mo.	Coffey, Nebr.
Andresen, Minn.	Boren	Carlson	Coffey, Wash.
Arends	Boykin	Carter	Collins
Arnold	Brewster	Cartwright	Colmer
Ashbrook	Brooks	Case, S. Dak.	Connery

Cooley	Hamilton	McSweeney	Rutherford
Cooper	Harrington	Magnuson	Ryan
Cox	Havenner	Mahon, S. C.	Sadowski
Cravens	Hendricks	Mahon, Tex.	Sanders
Crawford	Hennings	Martin, Colo.	Satterfield
Creal	Hildebrandt	Mason	Sauthoff
Crosser	Hill	Massingale	Schaefer, Ill.
Crowe	Hobbs	Maverick	Schneider, Wis.
Culkin	Honeyman	Mead	Schulte
Cummings	Hook	Meeks	Scott
Deen	Hope	Michener	Secrest
Dempsey	Houston	Mills	Shanley
DeRouen	Hull	Mitchell, Tenn.	Shannon
Dies	Hunter	Mosler, Ohio	Sheppard
Dingell	Imhoff	Mott	Short
Disney	Izac	Mouton	Sirovich
Dockweiler	Jacobsen	Murdock, Ariz.	Smith, Conn.
Doughton	Jarman	Murdock, Utah	Smith, Maine
Dowell	Jenckes, Ind.	Nelson	Smith, Va.
Doxey	Jenkins, Ohio	Nichols	Smith, Wash.
Drewry, Va.	Jenks, N. H.	O'Brien, Mich.	South
Driver	Johnson, Luthera.	O'Connell, Mont.	Sparkman
Duncan	Johnson, Lyndon	O'Connor, Mont.	Spence
Dunn	Johnson, Minn.	O'Day	Stack
Eckert	Johnson, Okla.	Oliver	Starnes
Eicher	Johnson, W. Va.	Owen	Stefan
Elliott	Keller	Pace	Summers, Tex.
Englebright	Kerr	Parsons	Sutphin
Farley	Kirwan	Patman	Sweeney
Ferguson	Kitchens	Patrick	Taylor, Tenn.
Fitzgerald	Kniffin	Patterson	Teigan
Fleger	Knutson	Patton	Terry
Fletcher	Kopplemann	Pearson	Thom
Ford, Calif.	Kramer	Peterson, Fla.	Thomas, Tex.
Ford, Miss.	Kvale	Peterson, Ga.	Thomason, Tex.
Fries, Ill.	Lambertson	Phillips	Thurston
Fuller	Lambeth	Pierce	Tobey
Fulmer	Lanham	Plumley	Tolan
Garrett	Larrabee	Posge	Transue
Gasque	Lea	Polk	Treadway
Gearhart	Leavy	Quinn	Turner
Gehrmann	Lemke	Rankin	Vincent, Ky.
Gilchrist	Lesinski	Reece, Tenn.	Vinson, Ga.
Gingery	Lucas	Reed, Ill.	Voorhis
Gray, Ind.	Luckey, Nebr.	Reed, N. Y.	Wallgren
Green	Luecke, Mich.	Rees, Kans.	Wene
Greenwood	McClellan	Rellly	West
Greever	McFarlane	Rich	White, Ohio
Gregory	McGehee	Richards	Wilcox
Griffith	McGrath	Rigney	Williams
Grissold	McGroarty	Robertson	Withrow
Guyer	McLaughlin	Robinson, Utah	Wolverton
Gwynne	McReynolds	Robson, Ky.	Wood
Halleck		Romjue	Zimmerman

NAYS—139

Andrews	Drew, Pa.	Kleberg	Rabaut
Bacon	Eaton	Kocialkowski	Ramsay
Barry	Eberharter	Lanzetta	Ramspeck
Barton	Edmiston	Lewis, Colo.	Rayburn
Bates	Engel	Lewis, Md.	Rockefeller
Beam	Evans	Long	Rogers, Mass.
Beiter	Faddis	Lord	Sabath
Bloom	Fernandez	Ludlow	Sacks
Boehne	Fish	McAndrews	Schuetz
Boland, Pa.	Fitzpatrick	McCormack	Seger
Boyer	Flaherty	McGranery	Shafer, Mich.
Boylan, N. Y.	Flannery	McKeough	Simpson
Bradley	Forand	McLean	Smith, W. Va.
Buckley, N. Y.	Frey, Pa.	Maas	Snell
Byrne	Gamble, N. Y.	Maloney	Somers, N. Y.
Cannon, Wis.	Gavagan	Mansfield	Sullivan
Casey, Mass.	Gifford	Mapes	Swope
Church	Gildea	Martin, Mass.	Taber
Clason	Gray, Pa.	May	Tarver
Cluett	Haines	Merritt	Thomas, N. J.
Cochran	Hancock, N. Y.	Mitchell, Ill.	Thompson, Ill.
Cole, Md.	Harlan	Moser, Pa.	Tinkham
Cole, N. Y.	Hart	Norton	Towey
Costello	Harter	O'Brien, Ill.	Umstead
Crowther	Hartley	O'Connell, R. I.	Wadsworth
Cullen	Healey	O'Connor, N. Y.	Walter
Curley	Hoffman	O'Leary	Warren
Daly	Jarrett	O'Malley	Welch
Delaney	Kee	O'Neal, Ky.	Whittington
DeMuth	Kelly, Ill.	O'Neill, N. J.	Wigglesworth
Dickstein	Kelly, N. Y.	O'Toole	Wolcott
Dirksen	Kennedy, Md.	Palmisano	Wolfenden
Dixon	Kennedy, N. Y.	Pettengill	Woodruff
Dondero	Keogh	Pfeifer	Woodrum
Dorsey	Kinzer	Powers	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Luce

NOT VOTING—27

Barden	Douglas	McMillan	Taylor, Colo.
Bland	Flannagan	Randolph	Taylor, S. C.
Bulwinkle	Gambrill, Md.	Rogers, Okla.	Wearin
Celler	Goldsborough	Scrugham	Weaver
Champion	Hancock, N. C.	Smith, Okla.	Whelchel
Crosby	Holmes	Snyder, Pa.	White, Idaho
Ditter	Lamneck	Steagall	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Goldsborough with Mr. Luce.
 Mr. Barden with Mr. Holmes.
 Mr. Bland with Mr. Ditter.
 Mr. Lamneck with Mr. Douglas.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Snyder of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Weaver with Mr. Celler.
 Mr. Hancock of North Carolina with Mr. White of Idaho.
 Mr. Taylor of South Carolina with Mr. Scrugham.
 Mr. Randolph with Mr. Crosby.
 Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Wearin.
 Mr. Gambrill of Maryland with Mr. Whelchel.
 Mr. Steagall with Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma.
 Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Smith of Oklahoma.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. DEROUEN, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. FORD of California changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I do not know how the gentleman would vote on this amendment, so I withdraw my vote of "nay" and ask to be recorded as being present.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BACON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BACON moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 679 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to that committee to report the resolution back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 1, line 4, strike out title I and insert the following as a substitute:

"That to provide relief, and work relief, and to increase employment, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,250,000,000, which shall be available for the period commencing July 1, 1938, and ending on January 31, 1939.

"Sec. 2. (a) Not more than \$1,150,000,000 of the sum appropriated by section 1 shall be available for grants-in-aid to States to assist them in financing and administering such forms of relief and work relief and methods of increasing employment as may be determined upon and undertaken by them. Such amount shall be allocated by the Federal Relief Board (hereinafter established), with the approval of the President, among the several States upon the basis of the Board's findings and conclusions with respect to the facts concerning and weight to be given to unemployment and living costs in, and population and financial resources of the several States. Not more than 15 percent of such amount shall be paid to any State.

"(b) The sum allocated to a State under subsection (a) shall be paid quarterly by order of the Federal Relief Board to the State if—

"(1) The Governor (or in the case of the District of Columbia, the District Commissioners) has certified to the Federal Relief Board that there has been established a board of relief trustees in such State, the membership of which is not composed solely of individuals who are members of the same political party, and that such board has the power and duty of receiving and disbursing sums which may be granted such State under this section;

"(2) The State board has certified to the Federal Relief Board that the State, or its subdivisions, or both, have provided or are prepared to provide an amount equal to not less than 25 percent of the amount allocated to it under this section, for relief, work relief, or methods of increasing employment; and

"(3) The State board has agreed to furnish to the Federal Relief Board such reports (respecting the administration of the relief, work relief, or methods of increasing employment with respect to which funds allocated to the State under this section are used) in such form and containing such information as the Federal Relief Board may from time to time require, and to comply with such provisions as the Federal Relief Board may from time to time find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(c) If the Federal Relief Board finds that any part of an amount granted to a State under this section has been diverted to a purpose not reasonably within the purpose of furnishing relief, work relief, or increasing employment, or that more than 80 percent of the amount devoted to such purposes has been expended out of grants under this section, the amount of future grants to be made to the State shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount the Board determines has been diverted or the amount the Board determines to be such excess.

"(d) The Federal Relief Board shall allocate, out of the sum specified in subsection (a), such sums as it deems necessary on the basis of the needs of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone for relief, work relief, and increasing employment. Such sums shall be expended as the Board prescribes as necessary for such purposes and subject to such requirement, if any, as the Board may prescribe for contribution by the possessions to such purposes.

"Sec. 3. Not more than \$100,000,000 of the sum appropriated by section 1 shall be available to enable the Federal Relief Board, with the approval of the President, in its discretion and on its order, to make such grants or loans to States as it deems necessary in order to meet extraordinary and unforeseen emergencies, and such grants or loans shall be made without regard to the provisions of section 2. The sum specified in this section shall also be available for all administrative expenses of the United States in carrying out the provisions of section 2 and this section.

"Sec. 4. (a) There is hereby established the Federal Relief Board, which shall be composed of three members appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than two of the members of the Board shall be members of the same political party and the President shall designate one of the members as chairman. Each member shall receive a salary at the rate of \$10,000 per annum.

"(b) The Board shall have the power and duty of carrying out sections 2 and 3 of this act, and such powers and duties shall be exercised under the direction and subject to the approval of the President.

"(c) The Board is authorized to make such expenditures, and, subject to the civil-service laws and rules and regulations made thereunder and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, as may be necessary to carry out its powers and duties.

"Sec. 5. Any person who knowingly makes any false statement in connection with securing a grant or loan or making any report or furnishing any information under section 2 or 3, or who solicits or receives political contributions from any person who directly or indirectly receives any part of a grant or loan made under sections 2 or 3, or any person who, in administering any such grant or loan, discriminates against any person on account of race, religion, or political affiliation shall, on conviction thereof, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both. For the purposes of this section, each payment made by a State to which a grant or loan has been made under sections 2 or 3 for relief, work relief, or increasing employment shall be considered to consist one-fourth of funds of the State and three-fourths of funds of the United States.

"Sec. 6. The funds herein appropriated shall be so apportioned and distributed over the period beginning July 1, 1938, and ending on January 31, 1939, and shall be so administered during such period as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished during such period for relief purposes.

"Sec. 7. As used in this act, the term 'State' means the several States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia.

"Sec. 8. This act may be cited as the Relief Appropriation Act of 1938."

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 89, nays 308, answered "present" 3, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—89

Allen, Ill.	Fish	McLean	Shafer, Mich.
Andresen, Minn.	Gamble, N. Y.	Maas	Short
Andrews	Gearhart	Mapes	Simpson
Arends	Gifford	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Maine
Bacon	Gilchrist	Mason	Snell
Bates	Griswold	Michener	Taber
Boehne	Guyer	Mott	Taylor, Tenn.
Brewster	Gwynne	Oliver	Thomas, N. J.
Carlson	Halleck	Pace	Thurston
Carter	Hancock, N. Y.	Pettengill	Tinkham
Case, S. Dak.	Hartley	Plumley	Tobey
Church	Hoffman	Powers	Treadway
Clark, N. C.	Hope	Reece, Tenn.	Wadsworth
Clason	Jarrett	Reed, Ill.	West
Cluett	Jenkins, Ohio	Reed, N. Y.	White, Ohio
Cole, N. Y.	Jenks, N. H.	Rees, Kans.	Wigglesworth
Crawford	Kinzer	Rich	Wolcott
Crowther	Knutson	Robison, Ky.	Wolfenden
Culkin	Lambertson	Rockefeller	Wolverton
Dirksen	Lambeth	Rogers, Mass.	Woodruff
Dondero	Lamneck	Rutherford	
Eaton	Lord	Ryan	
Englebright	Ludlow	Seeger	

NAYS—308

Aleshire	Drewry, Va.	Kerr	Peterson, Ga.
Allen, Del.	Driver	Kirwan	Pfeifer
Allen, La.	Duncan	Kitchens	Phillips
Allen, Pa.	Dunn	Kleberg	Pierce
Amle	Eberharter	Kniffin	Poage
Anderson, Mo.	Eckert	Kocalkowski	Polk
Arnold	Edmiston	Kopplemann	Quinn
Ashbrook	Elcher	Kramer	Rabaut
Atkinson	Elliott	Kvale	Ramsay
Barry	Evans	Lanham	Ramspeck
Beam	Faddis	Lanzetta	Rankin
Belter	Farley	Larrabee	Rayburn
Bell	Ferguson	Lea	Reilly
Bernard	Fernandez	Leavy	Richards
Biermann	Fitzgerald	Lemke	Rigney
Bigelow	Fitzpatrick	Lesinski	Robertson
Binderup	Flaherty	Lewis, Colo.	Robinson, Utah
Blom	Flannery	Long	Romjue
Bolleau	Fleger	Lucas	Sabath
Boland, Pa.	Fletcher	Luckey, Nebr.	Sacks
Boren	Forand	Luecke, Mich.	Sadowski
Boyer	Ford, Calif.	McAndrews	Sanders
Boykin	Ford, Miss.	McClellan	Satterfield
Boylan, N. Y.	Frey, Pa.	McCormack	Sauthoff
Bradley	Fries, Ill.	McFarlane	Schaefer, Ill.
Brooks	Fuller	McGehee	Schneider, Wis.
Brown	Fulmer	McGranery	Schneider, Wis.
Buck	Garrett	McGrath	Schulze
Buckler, Minn.	Gasque	McGroarty	Scott
Buckley, N. Y.	Gavagan	McKeough	Secrest
Burch	Gehrmann	McLaughlin	Shanley
Burdick	Gildea	McReynolds	Shannon
Byrne	Gingery	McSweeney	Sheppard
Caldwell	Gray, Ind.	Magnuson	Sirovich
Cannon, Mo.	Gray, Pa.	Mahon, S. C.	Smith, Conn.
Cartwright	Green	Mahon, Tex.	Smith, Va.
Casey, Mass.	Greenwood	Maloney	Smith, Wash.
Chandler	Greever	Mansfield	Smith, W. Va.
Chapman	Gregory	Martin, Colo.	Somers, N. Y.
Citron	Griffith	Massingale	South
Clark, Idaho	Haines	Maverick	Sparkman
Claypool	Hamilton	May	Spence
Cochran	Hancock, N. C.	Mead	Stack
Coffee, Nebr.	Harlan	Meeks	Starnes
Coffee, Wash.	Harrington	Merritt	Stefan
Cole, Md.	Hart	Mills	Sullivan
Collins	Harter	Mitchell, Ill.	Summers, Tex.
Colmer	Havener	Mitchell, Tenn.	Sutphin
Connelly	Healey	Moser, Pa.	Sweeney
Cooley	Hendricks	Mosier, Ohio	Swope
Cooper	Hennings	Mouton	Tarver
Costello	Hildebrandt	Murdock, Ariz.	Teigan
Cox	Hill	Murdock, Utah	Terry
Cravens	Hobbs	Nelson	Thom
Creal	Honeyman	Nichols	Thomas, Tex.
Crosser	Hook	Norton	Thomason, Tex.
Crowe	Houston	O'Brien, Ill.	Thompson, Ill.
Cullen	Hull	O'Brien, Mich.	Tolan
Cummings	Hunter	O'Connell, Mont.	Towey
Curlley	Imhoff	O'Connell, R. I.	Transue
Daly	Izac	O'Connor, Mont.	Turner
Deen	Jacobsen	O'Connor, N. Y.	Umstead
Delaney	Jarman	O'Day	Vincent, Ky.
Dempsey	Jenckes, Ind.	O'Leary	Vinson, Ga.
DeMuth	Johnson, Luther A.	O'Malley	Voorhis
DeRoven	Johnson, Lyndon	O'Neal, Ky.	Wallgren
Dickstein	Johnson, Minn.	O'Neill, N. J.	Walter
Dies	Johnson, Okla.	O'Toole	Warren
Dingell	Johnson, W. Va.	Owen	Welch
Disney	Jones	Palmisano	Wene
Dixon	Kee	Parsons	Whittington
Dockweller	Keller	Patman	Wilcox
Dorsey	Kelly, Ill.	Patrick	Williams
Doughton	Kelly, N. Y.	Patterson	Withrow
Dowell	Kennedy, Md.	Patton	Wood
Doxey	Kennedy, N. Y.	Pearson	Woodrum
Drew, Pa.	Keogh	Peterson, Fla.	Zimmerman

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Barton Engel Luce

NOT VOTING—27

Barden	Ditter	McMillan	Taylor, Colo.
Bland	Douglas	Randolph	Taylor, S. C.
Bulwinkle	Flannagan	Rogers, Okla.	Wearin
Cannon, Wis.	Gambrell, Md.	Scruggam	Weaver
Celler	Goldsborough	Smith, Okla.	Whelchel
Champion	Holmes	Snyder, Pa.	White, Idaho
Crosby	Lewis, Md.	Steagall	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. WEARIN. I therefore withdraw my vote of "yea" and ask to be recorded as being present.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, on this vote I am paired with the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. RANDOLPH. I therefore withdraw my vote of "yea" and answer "present."

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I have a pair with the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I therefore withdraw my vote of "yea" and ask to be recorded as being present.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:
On this vote:

Mr. Luce (for) with Mr. Goldsborough (against).
Mr. Barton (for) with Mr. Randolph (against).
Mr. Ditter (for) with Mr. Bland (against).
Mr. Engel (for) with Mr. Wearin (against).
Mr. Holmes (for) with Mr. Barden (against).

General pairs:

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Snyder of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Lewis of Maryland with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Taylor of South Carolina with Mr. Scrugham.
Mr. Gambrill of Maryland with Mr. Wheelchel.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Smith of Oklahoma.
Mr. Crosby with Mr. Flannagan.
Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Champion.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. WOODRUM and Mr. SNELL rose.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, on the final passage of the joint resolution, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 329, nays 70, answered "present" 3, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]

YEAS—329

Aleshire	Delaney	Havener	McSweeney
Allen, Del.	Dempsey	Healey	Maas
Allen, La.	DeMuth	Hendricks	Magnuson
Allen, Pa.	DeRoven	Hennings	Mahon, S. C.
Amle	Dickstein	Hildebrandt	Mahon, Tex.
Anderson, Mo.	Dies	Hill	Maloney
Arnold	Dingell	Hobbs	Mansfield
Ashbrook	Dirksen	Honeyman	Mapes
Atkinson	Disney	Hook	Martin, Colo.
Barry	Dixon	Hope	Massingale
Beam	Dockweiler	Houston	Maverick
Beiter	Dorsey	Hull	May
Bell	Doughton	Hunter	Mead
Bernard	Dowell	Imhoff	Meeks
Biermann	Doxey	Izac	Merritt
Bigelow	Drew, Pa.	Jacobsen	Mills
Binderup	Driver	Jarman	Mitchell, Ill.
Bloom	Duncan	Jenckes, Ind.	Mitchell, Tenn.
Boehne	Dunn	Jenks, N. H.	Moser, Pa.
Bolleau	Eberharter	Johnson, Luther A.	Mosier, Ohio
Boland, Pa.	Eckert	Johnson, Lyndon	Mott
Boren	Edmiston	Johnson, Minn.	Mouton
Boyer	Elcher	Johnson, Okla.	Murdock, Ariz.
Boykin	Elliott	Johnson, W. Va.	Murdoch, Utah
Boylan, N. Y.	Englebright	Jones	Nelson
Bradley	Evans	Kee	Nichols
Brewster	Faddis	Keller	Norton
Brooks	Farley	Kelly, Ill.	O'Brien, Ill.
Brown	Ferguson	Kelly, N. Y.	O'Brien, Mich.
Buck	Fernandez	Kennedy, Md.	O'Connell, Mont.
Buckler, Minn.	Fitzgerald	Kennedy, N. Y.	O'Connell, R. I.
Buckley, N. Y.	Fitzpatrick	Keogh	O'Connor, Mont.
Burdick	Flaherty	Kerr	O'Connor, N. Y.
Byrne	Flannery	Kirwan	O'Day
Caldwell	Fleger	Kitchens	O'Leary
Cannon, Mo.	Fletcher	Kleberg	O'Malley
Cannon, Wis.	Forand	Kocialkowski	O'Neal, Ky.
Carter	Ford, Calif.	Kopplemann	O'Neill, N. J.
Cartwright	Ford, Miss.	Kramer	O'Toole
Case, S. Dak.	Frey, Pa.	Kvale	Oliver
Casey, Mass.	Fries, Ill.	Lambeth	Owen
Chandler	Fuller	Lanham	Pace
Chapman	Fulmer	Lanzetta	Palmisano
Citron	Garrett	Larrabee	Parsons
Clark, Idaho	Gasque	Lea	Patman
Clark, N. C.	Gavagan	Leavy	Patrick
Claypool	Gearhart	Lemke	Patterson
Cochran	Gehrmann	Lesinski	Patton
Coffee, Nebr.	Gildea	Lewis, Colo.	Pearson
Coffee, Wash.	Gingery	Lewis, Md.	Peterson, Fla.
Cole, Md.	Gray, Ind.	Long	Pfeifer
Collins	Gray, Pa.	Lucas	Phillips
Colmer	Green	Luckey, Nebr.	Pierce
Connery	Greenwood	Ludlow	Plumley
Cooley	Greener	Luecke, Mich.	Poage
Cooper	Gregory	McAndrews	Powers
Costello	Griffith	McClellan	Quinn
Cravens	Griswold	McCormack	Rabaut
Creal	Guyer	McFarlane	Ramsay
Crosser	Haines	McGehee	Ramspeck
Crowe	Hamilton	McGranery	Rankin
Cullen	Hancock, N. C.	McGrath	Rayburn
Cummings	Harlan	McGroarty	Rees, Kans.
Curley	Harrington	McKeough	Reilly
Daly	Hart	McLaughlin	Richards
Deen	Harter	McReynolds	Rigney

Robinson, Utah	Shannon	Sweeney
Romjue	Sheppard	Swope
Ryan	Sirovich	Tarver
Sabath	Smith, Conn.	Teigan
Sacks	Smith, Maine	Terry
Sadowski	Smith, Wash.	Thom
Sanders	Smith, W. Va.	Thomas, Tex.
Satterfield	Somers, N. Y.	Thomason, Tex.
Sauthoff	South	Thompson, Ill.
Schaefer, Ill.	Sparkman	Tobey
Schneider, Wis.	Spence	Tolan
Schuetz	Stack	Towey
Schulte	Starnes	Transue
Scott	Stefan	Turner
Secrest	Sullivan	Umstead
Seger	Summers, Tex.	Vincent, Ky.
Shanley	Sutphin	Vinson, Ga.

NAYS—70

Allen, Ill.	Eaton	McLean	Simpson
Andresen, Minn.	Fish	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Va.
Andrews	Gamble, N. Y.	Mason	Snell
Arends	Gifford	Michener	Taber
Bacon	Gilchrist	Peterson, Ga.	Taylor, Tenn.
Bates	Gwynne	Pettengill	Thomas, N. J.
Burch	Halleck	Polk	Thurston
Carlson	Hancock, N. Y.	Reece, Tenn.	Tinkham
Church	Hartley	Reed, Ill.	Treadway
Clason	Hoffman	Reed, N. Y.	Wadsworth
Cluett	Jarrett	Rich	West
Cole, N. Y.	Jenkins, Ohio	Robertson	White, Ohio
Cox	Kinzer	Robison, Ky.	Wigglesworth
Crawford	Kniffin	Rockefeller	Wolcott
Crowther	Knutson	Rogers, Mass.	Wolfenden
Culkin	Lambertson	Rutherford	Woodruff
Dondero	Lamneck	Shafer, Mich.	
Drewry, Va.	Lord	Short	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3

Barton	Engel	Luce
Barden	Douglas	Rogers, Okla.
Bland	Flannagan	Scrugham
Bulwinkle	Gambrill, Md.	Smith, Okla.
Celler	Goldsborough	Snyder, Pa.
Champion	Holmes	Steagall
Crosby	McMillan	Taylor, Colo.
Ditter	Randolph	Taylor, S. C.

NOT VOTING—25

Wearin
Weaver
Wheelchel
White, Idaho

So the resolution was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Goldsborough (for) with Mr. Luce (against).
Mr. Randolph (for) with Mr. Barton (against).
Mr. Bland (for) with Mr. Ditter (against).
Mr. Wearin (for) with Mr. Engel (against).
Mr. Barden (for) with Mr. Holmes (against).

General pairs:

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Snyder of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Taylor of South Carolina with Mr. Scrugham.
Mr. Gambrill of Maryland with Mr. Wheelchel.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Smith of Oklahoma.
Mr. Crosby with Mr. Flannagan.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Champion.
Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. RANDOLPH. I withdraw my vote of "no" and answer "present."

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH. I withdraw my vote and ask to be recorded as present.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. WEARIN, and I withdraw my vote and ask to be recorded as present.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. WOODRUM, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCKLEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a radio address made by my colleague, Mr. HEALEY, on May 9, 1938.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LAUNCHING OF THE U. S. S. NAVAL DESTROYERS "ROWAN" AND "STACK" AT THE NORFOLK NAVY YARD ATTENDED BY 14 MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point, and to include three brief addresses by Members of the House made at the launching of two destroyers at the Norfolk Navy Yard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, in the presence of 14 Members of the House of Representatives composing a delegation headed by Chairman CARL VINSON, of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, there were launched at the Norfolk Navy Yard on Thursday, May 5, two great naval torpedo-boat destroyers, the *Rowan* and *Stack*, termed by experts as the most efficient and effective of their type in the world today. The occasion was one of the most notable in the history of the Norfolk Navy Yard, now one of the Nation's greatest and most efficient of naval establishments.

The twin craft, the U. S. S. *Rowan* and the U. S. S. *Stack*, each 341 feet long with standard displacement of 1,500 tons, had been constructed in one of the large drydocks at the Norfolk yard, while the regular building ways at that yard were being rehabilitated and enlarged preparatory to capital-ship construction incident to the naval expansion program of the Nation, which has just been authorized by the present Congress.

The day was a gala one at the Norfolk Navy Yard and the double launching occurred in the presence of more than 5,000 people. Assistant Secretary of the Navy Charles Edison attended along with high ranking naval officials and some 200 Irish veterans of the World War from Philadelphia and New York, the latter as accompanying guests of our House colleague, Hon. MICHAEL J. STACK, of Pennsylvania, whose charming daughter, Miss Mary Theresa Stack, was the sponsor for the destroyer *Stack*, named in memory of her ancestor, Lt. Edward Stack, native son of the Emerald Isle, who, coming to America, entered the United States Marine Corps and served with John Paul Jones when the latter began to recruit French volunteers for the *Bonhomme Richard*.

Hon. JOHN O'CONNOR of New York, honored Member of this House, was the principal speaker of the occasion that marked the launching of the *Rowan* and *Stack*. It was under sunny skies that Capt. R. W. Ryden, United States Navy, industrial manager of the Norfolk Navy Yard, at noon-time announced to the assembled throng that a double launching was to occur. Anchors Aweigh, sounded by a naval band from the battleship *New York*, flagship of the United States Training Fleet, then at the Norfolk yard, preceded the presentation by Captain Ryden of Rear Admiral Manley H. Simons, United States Navy, the able commandant of the Norfolk yard, who greeted the visitors and opened the ceremonies of the day. Commander W. W. Elder, United States Navy, chaplain of the Norfolk yard, pronounced the invocation.

Introduced by Rear Admiral Simons, it was my distinction to have the honor of presenting to the great assemblage present our colleagues Hon. CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee; Hon. JOHN O'CONNOR, of New York, chairman of the House Rules Committee; and Hon. MICHAEL J. STACK, member of the House Naval Affairs Committee.

At 12:25 o'clock the band played the Stars and Stripes. Five minutes later the two sponsors were introduced—Miss Elizabeth H. Rowan, great-granddaughter of Vice Admiral Rowan, for the *Rowan*, and Miss Mary Theresa Stack for the *Stack*. Miss Ruth Cotton was flower girl for the *Rowan* and Miss Allene Louisa Action for the *Stack*.

At 12:40 o'clock with one long blast from the Norfolk Navy Yard whistle and with the band playing Don't Give up the Ship, the two destroyers were launched from the drydock in which they were built in flooded waters from the historic Elizabeth River of Virginia.

Following the launching, the two sponsors were presented with attractive gifts on behalf of the Navy Yard Cooperative Association. Both were presented with handsome wrist watches, the silver christening containers and their mahogany boxes, and a book of "sponsors" containing the names of all those who have sponsored naval vessels in the past. C. D. Freeman presented the gifts to Miss Rowan and J. L. Williams to Miss Stack.

The launching ceremonies were followed in the early afternoon by a notable reception with Rear Admiral Simons and the official personnel of the Norfolk yard hosts of the occasion at the Officers Club of the yard.

Members of Congress attending the launching were: Chairman CARL VINSON, of Georgia; MICHAEL J. STACK, of Pennsylvania; JOHN J. McGRATH, of California; JOHN M. O'CONNELL, of Rhode Island; ALFRED N. PHILLIPS, of Connecticut; GEORGE J. BATES, of Massachusetts; ARTHUR B. JENKS, of New Hampshire; NORMAN R. HAMILTON, of Virginia, of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House; JOHN O'CONNOR, of New York; WILLIAM R. THOM, of Ohio; JOSEPH E. CASEY, of Massachusetts; JAMES M. FITZPATRICK, of New York; PAUL R. GREEVER, of Wyoming; and FRANK W. FRIES, of Illinois.

DESTROYERS NAMED FOR PATRIOTS

The keels of the twin destroyers *Rowan* and *Stack* were laid down at the Norfolk Navy Yard June 25, 1937. The *Rowan*, known officially in the Navy as *Destroyer No. 405*, is named in memory of the late Vice Admiral Stephen C. Rowan, who was born in Dublin, Ireland, on December 25, 1808. He was appointed midshipman from Ohio in 1826, and served with distinction in the Seminole War, the Mexican War, and the War Between the States. He was commissioned captain on July 16, 1862, and, for conspicuous gallantry, was promoted to the rank of commodore on the same day. During 1866-67 he commanded the Norfolk Navy Yard. He later commanded the Asiatic Squadron and while on this duty was promoted to the rank of vice admiral.

The *Stack*, known officially in the Navy as *Destroyer No. 406*, is named in memory of Lt. Edward Stack, United States Marine Corps, who was born in Keeland, County Kerry, Ireland, on April 26, 1756. When John Paul Jones began to recruit French volunteers for the *Bonhomme Richard*, Stack was a sublieutenant in Walsh's famous regiment of marine artillery attached to the French Navy. He received permission from the French naval authorities to join Jones' expedition. He served with great bravery under Jones and was especially mentioned in Jones' report of the engagement with the *Serapis*. He continued in the service of the United States until 1780 when he returned to the French Army and served in America as aide-de-camp to the Marquis de Viomenil during the Revolutionary War.

The addresses of Hon. CARL VINSON, of Georgia, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House; Hon. JOHN O'CONNOR, of New York, chairman of the Rules Committee of the House; and Hon. MICHAEL J. STACK, of Pennsylvania, member of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House and father of the sponsor of the destroyer *Stack*, follow:

ADDRESS OF MR. VINSON

Mr. Secretary Edison, Admiral Simons, other distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen and employees, all of the Norfolk Navy Yard, the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, together with members of the Naval Appropriations Committee and other Members of Congress, are delighted to be here today with our beloved colleague, NORMAN R. HAMILTON, of the Second Virginia District, for the launching of two of the Navy's latest destroyers.

These two fine vessels, the *Rowan* and *Stack*, are examples of the Navy's best, produced by workmanship, we are told by Mr. HAMILTON, that ranks second to none, and this, after seeing your fine yard, knowing what it produces and can produce, we are ready to accept.

We know the Norfolk Navy Yard but we never before have seen it in such peacetime activity. It ranks today as one of America's most outstanding naval establishments, but there are greater things ahead for it, and this at a very early time.

With the fine new building ways that have been obtained for you by Congressman HAMILTON, at a cost of nearly \$700,000 and without which the Norfolk yard would not have been prepared to secure capital-ship construction, this yard is now ready to build a modern battleship. This I promise you that you are going to build and I am for calling her after my own State, the *Georgia*—a great modern battleship to be built in a great Southern navy yard, and named for the Empire State of the South.

With \$4,000,000 for further expansion of the Norfolk yard approved by the Budget for inclusion in a deficiency bill now to be presented to the present Congress, this yard will soon see even greater activity than is apparent today. Your yard is already a wonderful one but you can see it is to be made even greater.

We are proud with you and glad to share a part in the authorization of those things that are making your expansion possible.

Again I want to say how pleased we are to be in Norfolk and Portsmouth, the home community of NORMAN HAMILTON. Your Congressman is one of whom you can well feel proud. There is no Representative in the Congress who has a record for harder work or for greater accomplishment of those things for which he goes after. Mr. HAMILTON is one of the most valued and active members of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House.

We are for NORMAN HAMILTON, and we are sure you must be for him because he is ever after all of us at Washington in behalf of those things that will best benefit his constituency. If he is not after building ships at the Norfolk Navy Yard and other things that will improve your vast governmental activities here, he is then after doing things for the farmers of his district—talking potatoes, peanuts, and cotton.

ADDRESS OF MR. O'CONNOR

Mr. Secretary, Admiral Simons, officers, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, and the 6,000 workers in this great Navy Yard of Norfolk, Va., permit me to first express my appreciation of the distinctive honor conferred upon me of being invited here today as the principal speaker, at the kind invitation of Admiral Simons, your commandant, and at the suggestion of the distinguished Member of Congress, the Representative of this district in the House of Representatives, my good friend NORMAN R. HAMILTON, of Portsmouth, and also at the suggestion of my good friend the Honorable MICHAEL J. STACK, Representative from Philadelphia, and a member of the great Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

Permit me to say, in part, that during the 15 years I have been a Member of the House of Representatives, I have seen thousands of Members of that body and have come to know them intimately. There is a certain measure applied to new Members; this yardstick includes personality, intelligence, and industry. May I say, with all sincerity, that your Congressman, NORMAN HAMILTON, possesses all these qualifications.

If the Norfolk Navy Yard misses out on what it thinks it ought to get it will not have been due to any lethargy on the part of your Congressman.

This great gathering here today is foregathered for the purpose of launching two great ships of the United States Navy. The professional pacifists—which is another way of saying Communists—will say that these two beautiful ships portend war. Well, of course, if you peel a professional pacifist, you will find a militaristic "red" who would leave our country absolutely defenseless against other nations, except possibly Russia.

To my mind, these two graceful crafts are indicia of national defense—not war. The basis of their conception is to preserve this great democratic Republic against the onslaught of any or all nations. Does any red-blooded American contend against us doing that?

It is so trite it is hardly worth while of repetition that the greatest safeguard for peace is preparedness for war. Any thinking American will subscribe to our program to provide a navy sufficient to stand out there 2,000 miles in the Atlantic and the Pacific and repel any threat of the invasion of our shores by any nation—bar none. Anything less will not suffice, and these two gallant ships, when they are floated today, will join that great American armada as a contribution to the security of America and the peace of the world.

There is a great temptation on my part today to review the illustrious career of the two distinguished men after whom these destroyers are named. That temptation naturally arises from the fact that my name happens to be O'CONNOR, and that my good friend, "MIKE" STACK, of Philadelphia, is interested in this ceremony. His attractive little daughter will christen the U. S. S. *Stack*.

Add to that the historical fact that the two great men after whom these ships are named were both born in Ireland. Coincidences are the strangest happenings of our lives.

This ship here is named after Lt. Edward Stack, of the United States Marine Corps.

Edward Stack was born at Kealand, County Kerry, Ireland, April 26, 1756, and died at Calais, France, December 1833.

When John Paul Jones began to recruit French volunteers for the *Bonhomme Richard*, Stack was a sublieutenant in Walsh's famous regiment of Marine Artillery, attached to the French Navy. He received permission from the French naval authorities to join Jones' expedition. Stack was given an appointment as second lieutenant of marines, February 4, 1779. He was placed in command of the division in the main top during the fight with the *Serapis*, September 23, 1799, where he served with great bravery and was especially mentioned in Jones' report of the action. The success of Jones on this occasion was very largely due to superiority aloft where the Americans drove the British out of their tops and harassed them on deck. A grenade thrown from aloft fired a chain of ammunition on the *Serapis* and caused a severe explosion which was a principal factor in her surrender.

Edward Stack continued in the United States service until 1780, when he returned to duty in the French Army. For his distinguished service on the *Bonhomme Richard*, the King of France promoted him to a captaincy in the French Army, with an annuity of 400 livres, and permitted him to retain his commission in the United States Marine Corps.

Captain Stack came to America as aide de camp to the Marquis de Viomenil and served throughout all the campaigns of that army during the Revolutionary War.

He was one of the original members of the Order of the Cincinnati in France, his name being proposed by John Paul Jones with the highest commendation of his service.

This other ship is named after Vice Admiral Stephen C. Rowan, of the United States Navy.

Born in Ireland in 1805, he was appointed midshipman in the United States Navy in 1826; took active part in the War with Mexico and in the acquisition of California. In 1861 he was in command of the *Pawnee*; he took part in the capture of forts at Hatteras Inlet.

In 1826 he performed conspicuous service in command of a flotilla in the sounds of North Carolina, and in the attack of the Army and the Navy on Roanoke Island. Soon after this action, Rowan proceeded with 14 gunboats into Albemarle Sound and decisively defeated a squadron of Confederate gunboats in a sharp engagement lasting more than an hour. For his brilliant achievements he was promoted to the rank of commodore.

He commanded naval forces at the fall of New Bern and participated at Forts Wagner, Gregg, and Moultrie. He commanded *New Ironsides* off Charleston.

In 1870 he was made vice admiral of the Navy in recognition of his distinguished service.

There in those great ways, procured for this yard by Congressman Hamilton, will soon rise the form of a giant battleship.

Please let me say that these great symbols of the United States are not solely accounted for by reason of the illustrious heroes after whom they are named, nor are they the result of blueprints or specifications drawn in Washington. They are the handwork of our American workers, 6,000 of whom in this great navy yard can look today with pride in their hearts at the accomplishments of their craftsmanship. There is an oft-told tale of a bricklayer working on a church when somebody came along and said, "Pat, what are you doing, laying bricks?" and Pat replied, "No; I am building a cathedral."

Each and every one of you men in this navy yard can hold his head high to the sun and as he watches these two ships floated in the water, he can say to himself, "Well, there's my contribution to the defense and the perpetuation of the United States of America."

ADDRESS OF MR. STACK

Admiral, my dear colleagues of the House, distinguished guests, ladies, gentlemen, and employees of the Norfolk Navy Yard, first, let me thank you from the bottom of my heart for the great honor you conferred on my little daughter, Mary Teresa, when you selected her to be the sponsor of the U. S. S. *Stack*. I am sure Mary Teresa, her mother, and the other members of the family and myself will consider May 5, 1938, as a red-letter day for the Stack family.

Lt. Edward Stack rendered signal services to your country and my adopted country in the *Bonhomme Richard* engagement with the *Serapis*, for which John Paul Jones cited him for bravery, and for which a grateful country, your country and my country, today is honoring his name by calling this modern destroyer after him.

We Americans, by adoption or by birth, love peace, but nevertheless are sensible pacifists; we believe in an adequate defense navy.

I hope the U. S. S. *Stack* will never have to engage in warfare, but if she does I am confident she will give as good an account of herself as the man, Lt. Edward Stack, for whom she was christened.

We who came from Philadelphia to celebrate with you, appreciate all the hospitality that your good citizens are giving us, particularly your chamber of commerce, the Elks, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, and your fine patriotic citizen, Rev. Father Blackburn. All who came with me from Philadelphia have repeated, over and over again, to me the wonderful treatment they have gotten from you, and I know your city will be well and favorably advertised by them.

Today is a very warm day and I do not want to detain you much longer, but I cannot let this opportunity pass without paying my humble respects to your very able Representative, NORMAN HAMILTON. He is a member of the Naval Affairs Committee with me, and

I value his good naval understanding of things and his statesmanship.

This morning while in one of your barber shops I happened to meet your city manager, Mr. Harper. He discovered that I was one of the visiting Congressmen and immediately asked me what kind of a Congressman Representative HAMILTON was. I told him that he was a very good Congressman; that he was too damn good; that he wanted everything for the Norfolk yard to the detriment of the Philadelphia yard, from which city I happen to hail. Congressman HAMILTON does some real thinking in the Halls of Congress for the good people of the second district of Virginia.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], who is a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that drafted the House Joint Resolution 679, the so-called recovery resolution, and who worked faithfully and diligently and taxed his strength severely for many weeks during the preparation of that measure, is ill at Walter Reed Hospital. He has asked me to state to the House that had he been present at the roll call on the passage of the bill he would have voted aye.

FLOOD-CONTROL BILL

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until tomorrow at midnight, Friday, May 13, to file a report upon the bill H. R. 10618, commonly known as the flood-control bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WAGES OF RAILROAD WORKERS

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WE MUST MAINTAIN RAILROAD WORKERS' WAGES

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, announcement has just been made by the Nation's railroads that, effective July 1, they will reduce the wages of their employees by 15 percent.

This is indeed a tragic situation. Approximately a million men receiving more than one and three-quarter billion dollars in annual wages, will be affected by this cut, if it is carried into effect. The total amount of the annual reduction will be in round figures more than a quarter of a billion dollars.

What this really means is that a quarter of a billion dollars per year less will be spent by the Nation's loyal railway workers for food, clothing, rent, and the other necessities of life. Railroad men as a class are family men. A generous part of their none-too-high earnings go for the sort of commodities indicated. They are generous contributors to the active channels of commerce of our Nation. In a word, they are spenders and builders. They are not tightwads and they do not fritter their money away for things that do not go toward upbuilding the sinews of business in the United States.

When I talk of this fine class of citizens, I know whereof I speak. Fortunately, I have thousands of railway employees in the district which I have the honor to represent. Most of them are my warm personal friends. I have known them nearly all my life. When I was in business I had many dealings with them. I have visited in their homes and they have visited in mine. This close association with them has made me honor and respect them. I feel the blow which is about to descend upon this worthy class of American citizens as keenly as if a member of my own family were to be affected.

Do not understand what I am saying about this wage cut to be a criticism of the steam railway operators. I regret exceedingly that they could not find some other way to effect the savings that they seek to make by this reduction in wages, but I appreciate also many of the difficulties which confront them. I firmly believe that they have taken this step as a last and seemingly necessary recourse.

The blame for this unfortunate circumstance belongs on the Interstate Commerce Commission. Much as I regret to say it, the Commission has in this instance, I believe, failed to grasp the facts in the situation and thus has inflicted this pending penalty on the workers. If the Commission had granted the increases in freight and passenger rates recently sought by the railways this proposed wage cut could have been avoided. The operating companies sought a general freight increase of 15 percent. Only a temporary increase of about 5 percent was granted. At the same time the eastern railroads sought to increase their passenger rate from 2 to 2½ cents a mile, but the Commission did not see fit to give them any increase at all in passenger rates. If these requests had been granted there would probably have been no effort made to cut wages.

It is unfortunate, indeed, that the transportation situation in the United States has been permitted to drift into its present chaotic state and that the workers must pay for the general legislative neglect of their industry. Nobody who has given the slightest attention to the situation need be surprised at the condition in which the country now finds its transportation. Whether it always has been apparent in the financial statements or not, steam railway transportation has been on the downgrade in this country for almost 2 decades. I shall not attempt to enumerate all the causes of it, but competition and increased material and tax costs have been enormous contributing factors. True, there was a 10-percent wage increase last year, but this necessary added expense was only a drop in the bucket as compared to the total amount of increased costs.

Official figures show that average revenues per ton and passenger miles have gone down steadily during the last 17 years. Freight actually is being hauled today at an average rate of less than 1 cent a ton per mile. There is no question in the mind of any reasonable man that this is not a fair rate. Passenger fares are less than 2 cents a mile, and, while some contend that low passenger fares make for increased revenue, the fact remains that passenger traffic is not paying its way generally. The question of efficiency of management has been a controversial one, but undoubtedly there have been improvements in many directions. Nevertheless, approximately a hundred railways in the United States are in the hands of receivers or trustees for the simple reason that they have not been able to make enough money to pay their bills.

What has happened in the steam railroad field is that managements have just been skimming along with the least possible amount of expenditure. Because they have not had the money they have not been buying the rolling stock they need. I am informed that during the next two decades, if the money were in sight, they would purchase new freight cars at the rate of 100,000 per year, at an annual expenditure of \$300,000,000. They also could use 2,000 locomotives annually at a similar cost. Other equipment expenditures, which would be made if the money were available, I am informed, would bring the annual expenditures for these items alone up to \$750,000,000 or a billion dollars a year. What a joyous substitute, indeed, this would be for governmental pump priming.

However, this money is not in sight. Nor is there money in sight to carry on as has been done in the immediate past. The whole problem cries to high heaven for careful study and intelligent solution. But not only are these two long-range steps not being taken, but immediate relief is denied and the blow falls directly on the workers' shoulders.

It is a sad situation when the boys on the trains, in the roundhouses and out in the yards have to carry the staggering burden of a nation's failure to meet one of its major problems openly and fearlessly.

I do not maintain that the 15-percent increase in freight rates would have brought about a permanent solution of the steam railway problem. Far from it. This problem will require years to solve. I do insist, however, that if this just request for rate increases had been granted, the burden of it would have been spread out thinly over our entire

population and would not have been severely felt by any one. Instead of this easy temporary solution of the problem, we have the load placed squarely on the shoulders of less than 1 percent of our population, the rank and file of railway workers.

The workers are planning to resist the proposed cut, and I am hopeful that some plan will be evolved that will make possible a maintenance of present wages. At this time I do not see how this is going to be accomplished. However, A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, one of the largest of the railway labor groups, declared after the announcement was made today that the cut would not be put into effect. He insisted that such a wage decrease would "influence a further downward spiral of business that will injure the railroads as well as other lines of business." Unquestionably, there is merit in his contention that a cut would be felt by business generally.

The most helpful aspect of the entire situation is that approximately 7 weeks will elapse before the proposed cut goes into effect. This is one of the fine things about steam railway labor affairs in this country. Both men and management are of such high type that they strive earnestly to work out their problems fairly to themselves and the public.

It seems to me that despite the previous ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission something still might be done to grant a temporary increase in freight rates. Such a step, I am sure, would have the general approval of the entire country. It will not approve the infliction of this unwarranted penalty on the men who toil with their hands to keep our great rail transportation system operating.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1939—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 10216) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10216) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 17 and 18. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$8,260"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That the Capitol Police Board is hereby authorized to detail police from the House and Senate Office Buildings for police duty on the Capitol Grounds"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 4 and 5.

JOHN F. DOCKWEILER,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
J. O. FERNANDEZ,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
D. LANE POWERS,

Managers on the part of the House.

M. E. TYDINGS,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
ALVA B. ADAMS,
PAT MCCARRAN,
FREDERICK HALE,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10216) making appropriations for the

legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Senate

On amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3, relating to the office of the Secretary: Provides three clerks at \$2,640 each, as proposed by the Senate, instead of two clerks at \$2,640 each, as proposed by the House; appropriates \$1,522.50 for a messenger from April 15, 1938, to June 30, 1939, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total of the appropriations for the office of the Secretary.

On amendments Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9, relating to the office of Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper: Provides for four attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms, as proposed by the Senate, instead of three, as proposed by the House; appropriates \$2,400 for an assistant superintendent in the press gallery, as proposed by the Senate; eliminates one messenger to press correspondents at \$2,160, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total of the appropriations made for this office.

On amendment No. 10: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the proviso attached to the appropriation for the repair and equipment of Senate kitchens and restaurants, requiring the addition of a minimum of 10 percent to each order in excess of 10 cents served in such restaurants and 20 percent to orders served outside of such restaurants.

On amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$8,260 for operating and maintaining motor vehicles under the offices of the Secretary and Sergeant at Arms instead of \$7,960 as proposed by the House and \$9,285 as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments Nos. 12, 13, and 14: Appropriates \$350 for postage stamps for the office of the Secretary, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$250, as proposed by the House, and \$150 for the same purpose for the office of the Sergeant at Arms, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$100, as proposed by the House, and corrects the total of funds to be expended for such purpose.

On amendments Nos. 15 and 16: Consolidates, as proposed by the Senate, the provisions of the House bill appropriating \$5,000 for the purchase of furniture and \$3,000 for materials for the repair of same.

House of Representatives

On amendments Nos. 17 and 18: Appropriates \$3,300 for the clerk of the Committee on Claims, as proposed by the House, instead of \$3,700, as proposed by the Senate, and corrects the total of the appropriation for committee employees in accordance with such action.

Capitol Police

On amendment No. 19: Restores the provision of the House permitting the detail of police from the House and Senate Office Buildings to work on the Capitol Grounds, amended so as to permit the detail of such police for police duty on such grounds.

Architect of the Capitol

On amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$6,000, as proposed by the Senate, for subway transportation between the Capitol and Senate Office Building instead of \$2,000 for such purpose, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 21: Appropriates \$1,560 for increasing the salaries of 26 custodial employees for the Senate Office Building from \$1,080 to \$1,140, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$5,000 for metal filing units for the Senate Office Building, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment No. 23: Appropriates \$375,240 for maintenance of the House Office Buildings, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$370,200, as proposed by the House.

On amendment No. 24: Perfects language relating to air-conditioning refrigeration, as proposed by the Senate.

Botanic Garden

On amendment No. 25: Authorizes the use of not to exceed \$250 for traveling expenses of the Director and his assistants, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$100, as proposed by the House.

Amendments in disagreement

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following amendments of the Senate:

On amendments Nos. 4 and 5: Relating to an increase in the salary of an assistant clerk to the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs.

JOHN F. DOCKWEILER,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
J. O. FERNANDEZ,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
D. LANE POWERS,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 4: Page 5, line 11, after the figures "\$3,600", insert "and \$1,400 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent."

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 5: Page 7, line 5, strike out "\$504,060" and insert in lieu "\$505,600."

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

MEMORIAL TO NEWTON D. BAKER

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 656, to provide for the erection of a memorial to the memory of Newton D. Baker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not think this late hour is any time to bring up new legislation. I shall object.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection a moment?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am going to object to its consideration at this late hour.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next may be in order on Tuesday. I may say in submitting this request that I have discussed it with the minority leader.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein some observations and figures written by a constituent in my district, Mr. Thomas Peck.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS, Mr. BINDERUP, and Mr. HILL asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech made by Governor La Follette, of Wisconsin, a few days ago.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio dialog between myself and Mr. Combs, president of the National Rural Letter Carriers' Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of spending, including an editorial recently published in that connection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks with reference to the F. B. I. deficit and to include some brief excerpts from letters, resolutions, and newspaper comments.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 623. Joint resolution making available additional funds for the United States Constitutional Sesqui-centennial Commission.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 16, 1938, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The first notice appearing below, regarding Mr. MALONEY's subcommittee meeting scheduled for Friday, May 13, 1938, has now been definitely postponed.

There will be a meeting of Mr. MALONEY's subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Friday, May 13, 1938. Business to be considered: Hearing on H. R. 4358, train dispatchers' bill.

There will be a meeting of Mr. SADOWSKI's subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Wednesday, May 18, 1938, for the consideration of H. R. 9739, to amend the Motor Carrier Act.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

There will be a full open hearing before the Committee on Naval Affairs Monday, May 16, 1938, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 4281, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to construct and maintain a Government radio broadcasting station; authorizing the United States Commissioner of Education to provide programs of national and international interest; making necessary appropriations for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the station and production of programs therefor; and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold public hearings Wednesday, May 18, 1938, at 10:30 a. m., in Room 445, House Office Building, for the consideration of H. R. 9907, and other unfinished business.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

There will be a hearing held before the Committee on the Judiciary, Wednesday, May 18, and Thursday, May 19, 1938, on the resolutions proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to provide suffrage for the people of the District of Columbia. The hearing will be held in the caucus room of the House Office Building beginning at 10 a. m. on the days mentioned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1311. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a recommendation for reduction in a supplemental estimate of appropriation for unemployment-compensation administration, as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, from \$7,000,000 to \$4,500,000 (H. Doc. No. 627); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1312. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1938, to remain available until June 30, 1939, amounting to \$72,500, for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 628); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1313. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate for foreign mail transportation, 1935, in the amount of \$6,412.08, together with proposed provisions affecting existing appropriations

for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1939 (H. Doc. No. 629); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1314. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, for the Department of Agriculture, amounting to \$35,000 (H. Doc. No. 630); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1315. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting the draft of a bill to provide for the exploitation of oil, gas, and other minerals on the lands comprising the Ellington Field Military Reservation, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1316. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill to provide for the ratification of statutes of Puerto Rico which have been passed in the form of joint resolutions instead of in the form of acts; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1317. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents," approved January 12, 1895, as amended, together with a supporting memorandum of April 26, 1938, which sets forth the reasons why such an amendment is necessary; to the Committee on Printing.

1318. A letter from the assistant of the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting a draft of a bill relative to an exchange of lands between the Department of Labor and the War Department, affecting the reservations pertaining to the Honolulu immigration station and Fort Armstrong; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 9287. A bill to authorize the Cairo Bridge Commission, or the successors of said commission, to acquire by purchase, and to improve, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cairo, Ill.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2343). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10076. A bill to create the White County Bridge Commission; defining the authority, power, and duties of said commission; and authorizing said commission and its successors and assigns to purchase, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Wabash River at or near New Harmony, Ind.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2344). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WITHROW: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10225. A bill to amend section 6 of chapter 64, approved April 24, 1894 (U. S. Stat. L., vol. XXVIII, 2d sess., 53d Cong.), being an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a steel bridge over the St. Louis River, between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota"; with amendment (Rept. No. 2345). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MALONEY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10261. A bill authorizing the town of Friar Point, Miss., and Coahoma County, Miss., singly or jointly, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River from a point at or near the town of Friar Point, Coahoma County, Miss., to a point at or near Helena, Phillips County, Ark.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2346). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MALONEY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10275. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge and causeway across the water between the mainland, at or near Cedar Point and Dauphin Island, Ala.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2347). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. EICHER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10297. A bill to extend the times for commencing

and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Rulo, Nebr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2348). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. EICHER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10346. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Niobrara, Nebr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2349). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MALONEY: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 10611. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Coosa River at or near Gilberts Ferry in Etowah County, Ala.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2350). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 10608. A bill relating to loans to railroads by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2351). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SATTERFIELD: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 8794. A bill to provide for terms of the district court at Newport News, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2352). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

ADVERSE REPORTS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on Labor. House Resolution 490. Resolution requesting the President to furnish certain information relative to the National Labor Relations Board (Rept. No. 2342). Laid on the table.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WHITTINGTON: A bill (H. R. 10618) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. FISH: A bill (H. R. 10619) making ineligible for appointment in the Diplomatic Service of the United States any person who contributes or loans to a political party a sum exceeding \$10,000; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEA: A bill (H. R. 10620) to remove existing reductions in compensation for transportation of Government property and troops incident to railroad land grants; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOREN: A bill (H. R. 10621) to protect the production and marketing of goods and materials essential to the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM: A bill (H. R. 10622) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines and the Director of the Geological Survey, to make scientific, technological, and economic investigations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. BYRNE: A bill (H. R. 10623) to make available certain sums to States which failed in 1936 or 1937 to take full advantage of the credit provisions of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEALEY: A bill (H. R. 10624) to prohibit judges of the district courts of the United States from participating in cases involving matters in which they have acted as counsel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKS: A bill (H. R. 10625) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the commencement on March 2, 1937, of the Historical Restoration Program at St. Augustine, Fla.; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Resolution (H. Res. 499) making S. 2338 and H. R. 10433, bills to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of cer-

tain public works, and for other purposes, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Kentucky: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 683) to provide for an additional tax on whisky; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DREW of Pennsylvania: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 684) to create a joint congressional committee to receive, consider, and prepare proposals for a national highway from Jersey City, N. J., to the city of Washington, D. C., and to make reports and recommendations thereon to the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAMILTON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 685) to provide for temporary operation by the United States of certain steamships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 686) to create a temporary National Economic Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 50) requesting that the Secretary of State urge the British Government to increase Jewish immigration to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 10626) granting an increase of pension to Nancy J. Halterman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILDEA: A bill (H. R. 10627) for the relief of Mike Kotis; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HART: A bill (H. R. 10628) for the relief of James Havey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 10629) for the relief of the village of Gaylord, Minn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEARIN: A bill (H. R. 10630) for the relief of J. Milton Sweney; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5105. By Mr. CURLEY: Petition of United Federal Workers of America, urging one-step increases for custodial employees of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

5106. Also, petition of United Cannery Agricultural Packing and Allied Workers of America, urging enactment of House bill 9745; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5107. Also, petition of United Federal Workers of America, urging enactment of House bill 8428, known as the Civil Service Appeal Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

5108. Also, petition of Interstate Conference of Unemployment Compensation Agencies, Washington, D. C., urging that the United States Employment Service be transferred to the United States Social Security Board; to the Committee on Labor.

5109. By Mr. FISH: Petition signed by Maurice R. Dey and 20 other residents of Orange County, N. Y., requesting continuance of the Federal art project under the Works Progress Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5110. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Memorial of Mrs. C. C. Pitts, State president, Ladies' Auxiliary to T. R. L. C. A., of Texas, favoring legislation liberalizing retirement to civil-service employees, including widows; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

5111. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., concerning House bill 9909, wool-labeling bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5112. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution of the Michigan Construction Federation, relating to the employ-

LXXXIII—431

ment of labor by the Government or any political subdivision thereof; to the Committee on Labor.

5113. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Kings County Consolidated Civic League, Brooklyn, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution No. 91, with reference to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 13, 1938

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 20, 1938)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 12, 1938, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On April 29, 1938:

S. 1279. An act to authorize the sale, under the provisions of the act of March 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 203), of surplus War Department real property; and

S. 1882. An act for the relief of the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation.

On May 9, 1938:

S. 477. An act to prevent fraud, deception, or other improper practice in connection with business before the United States Patent Office, and for other purposes;

S. 3351. An act to permit the issuance of certain certificates under the shipping laws by inspectors of hulls, inspectors of boilers, and designated assistant inspectors;

S. 3459. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire by donation land at or near Fort Missoula, Mont., for target range, military, or other public purposes; and

S. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution making funds available for the control of incipient or emergency outbreaks of insect pests or plant diseases, including grasshoppers, Mormon crickets, and chinch bugs," approved April 6, 1937.

On May 11, 1938:

S. 2307. An act to provide for the conservation of the fishery resources of the Columbia River, establishment, operation, and maintenance of one or more stations in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, and for the conduct of necessary investigations, surveys, stream improvements, and stocking operations for these purposes;

S. 2986. An act to amend section 6 of the act approved May 27, 1936 (49 U. S. Stat. L. 1380);

S. 2221. An act to facilitate the control of soil erosion and flood damage originating upon lands within the exterior boundaries of the Cache National Forest in the State of Utah; and

S. 2639. An act to regulate the leasing of certain Indian lands for mining purposes.

On May 12, 1938:

S. 1998. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the collection and publication of statistics of peanuts by the Department of Agriculture," approved June 24, 1936.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10216) making